DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 130 EA 013 155

AUTHOR Cusick, Philip A.
TITLE A Study of Networks Among the Professional Staffs of Two Secondary Schools.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Univ., East Lansing.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 1 Jul 80
GRANT 400-79-0004
NOTE 177p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Environment; Elective Courses; *Information Networks; *Interprofessional Relationship; Models; Secondary Education; *Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Behavior; *Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain the communication networks within two schools. The study was undertaken in two secondary schools in a metropolitan area and involved participant observation and interviews over the course of a school year. The purpose of the first part of the study was to enter the schools, identify the issues of importance, follow those issues, and trace out the communication networks. The investigator discovered minimal staff interaction around school issues. The second part of the model considered the set of relations that each teacher maintained with students for whom his or her particular approach worked. Teachers had considerable freedom in curriculum and instruction decisions, and based their approaches on personal predilections, background, and educational perspective, and on outside constraints. The third part of the model consists of the relations of teachers with professionals in the district. The report concludes that with their emphasis on a specialized elective system and the corresponding lack of standardized curriculum, supervision, and staff evaluation, these schools lack a generalized idea of what constitutes an education. Instead they have given control of the educational process to individual teachers who then strike agreements with sets of students. (Author/JK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED196130

A Study of Networks Among the Professional Staffs of Two Secondary Schools

by

Philip A. Cusick

Michigan State University

Submitted to the National Institute of Education

Grant #400-79-0004

Submitted

July 1, 1980

EA 013 155

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain the networks among the professional staffs of two secondary schools. The concept of network denotes a structure of a type of relation. It may be dichotomized into two meanings, the first called "field" denoting an egocentric entity with an individual or group looking out from a center, while the concept of network is kept to indicate the sum of all the relationships in a certain place. It is particularly useful for social scientists trying to formulate an abstracted idea of who interacts with whom in a particular place, and how the sum and the characteristics of the interactions effect the behavior. The study was undertaken in two large comprehensive secondary schools in a metropolitan area. One school had 2100 students, served a biracial urban population and had 101 teachers. The second school served 1500 students and had 68 teachers. The intent was to describe the interactions of staff members, to lodge the description in specific environments, and to generate heuristic theory to assist in thinking about secondary school.

The researchers use the methods of participant observation and interview. After soliciting the cooperation of one vice principal in either school to work as a co-researcher, permission was obtained from central office and building administrators and classroom teachers. The methods called for the researcher to be in one school on a daily basis. During that time he interviewed teachers, attended classes and meetings and to the degree possible took part in the life of

NOV 3 1980

the schools. At the same time the co-researchers assisted by identifying issues, suggesting informants, and helped to analyze working hypotheses and models. The researcher entered the schools in January 1979 and remained until March 1980.

The original intent was to enter the schools and after identifying the issues of importance, follow those issues and trace out the networks. However after entering the schools the researcher concluded that issues did not follow any path through the system. An issue was of general concern to one person, sometimes two or rarely three, but none was of general concern to the faculty. The important unit in the school was the individual teacher. The concluding argument is that a teacher's approach to curriculum and the general demands of teaching depends not on subject, collegues, or organizational ethic, but upon one's personal predilections, background, educational perspective, outside constraints etc. It was one's individual "field" not the network among teachers upon which one predicates his or her approach to the job.

Teachers had a great deal of freedom stemming from a (1) lack of internal supervision, (2) institutional neglect of any generalized conception of what constituted an education or how best to approach students, (3) the isolation from colleagues and the structural demand that one spend his days in the company of students who outnumber him by some large number to one, and (4) a contract that demanded they attend to school matters for seven hours a day, 180 days a year. One is hired, given an assignment demanding that he or she teach five classes, perhaps assume some other duties and then is left alone as long as he or she "gets along with kids." The schools are well able to handle ambiguity about what constitutes "getting along with kids."

But with their popularized curricula, elective system and dependence on the good will of the community for their financial survival, they cannot handle the strife that accompanies "not getting along with kids." Hence one's approach to a position was dependent on his or her own egocentric field, not on a network of collegues.

The second part of the model is the set of relations that each teacher maintained with a set of students for whom his or her particular approach worked. Teachers differed in their opinion as to what might be "good for kids" but the "kids" they had in mind were not hypothetical "kids," but real students whom they contacted in the past or were presently teaching and for whom their particular approach was deemed productive. This set of relations served to justify the personal approach based on one's field.

The third part of the model consists of the relations of teachers with other professionals in the school or in the district. There are two types of relationships. There are those friendships and personal relations of long standing to which one may avail himself to make his or her life in school more rewarding. Frequently these become an important part of one's field. But one may also maintain ties with certain individuals in the school such as the principal, the guidance counselor, athletic or activities director for purposes of garnering support for his or her pattern of accommodation to the job. Should one, for personal reasons, wish to coach a sport, sponsor a club, develop an honors class or change a text, there are people whom he or she needs and must cultivate in order to extend or at least protect the pattern. It was at this third level that the school could be said to approximate a "network."

The conclusion inferred in this model suggests that with their emphasis on a specialized elective system that allows students to choose their sets of courses from among many offerings, and a corresponding lack of standardized curriculum or supervision, and evaluation of staff, the schools have given up on any generalized idea of what constitutes an education and have instead given control of the process over to individual teachers who then strike agreements with sets of students. While this may be an acceptable mode of education, we doubt whether it was ever purposely intended by those who control public secondary education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

CHAPTER I

Purpose and Conceptual Framework 1
Summary to Purpose and Conceptual Framework 13
The Concept of Network as Applied to School 16
Summary to The Concept of Network as Applied to Schools 26
The Environment of Public Secondary Schools 31
Summary to The Environment of Public Secondary Schools 46

CHAPTER II

Description 49
Organization and Administration 53
Summary to Organization and Administration 63
The Teachers 64
Summary to the Teachers 100

PART II 102
Summary 111
Teachers and Teachers 113
Summary 131

CHAPTER III

Conclusions 135
Implications 143

CHAPTER IV

Conceptual Framework of Methodology 150
Some Methodological Considerations 153
Entering the School 157

CHAPTER I

Purpose and Conceptual Framework

The purpose of this study is to describe and explain the network of relations among the professional staffs of two large, comprehensive, secondary schools. The concept of "network" has been popular for some time particularly since Barnes used it to analyze social relations in a parish in western Norway. He defined a network as "a set of points, some of which are joined by lines. The points of the image are people or sometimes groups, the lines indicate which people interact with each other. We can think of the whole of social life as generating a network of this kind."[1] The concept may help to advance the investigation of social relations in several ways. It may provide a more complete view of the social environment of the individual. It may avoid the assumptions involved in labeling a set of persons with whom the individual has contact as a group. It may provide a structure for the dyadic sets of persons who have been selected from various structural categories or institutional settings, and it may allow structural aspects of the network to be related to characteristics of the relationship comprising the network.[2] A network, per se, is the geometrical structure of a type of relationship. One may concentrate on a network's size, shape, connectedness of points, mesh, density or defining relations, all or any of which may be treated as independent variables effecting individual and group behavior.

The concept is useful for the social scientist trying to formulate an abstract idea of who interacts with whom in a particular place and how the characteristics and sum of the interactions affect behavior. It may

also be useful for the individual in a specific place, calculating his chances for effecting some particular end, such as extending his influence or gaining a desired reward. Both parties, the social scientist and the inside strategist, may be thinking of interactions, structure and influence, but with the different emphasis, they are two quite separate concepts. The principal difference is with that of the social scientist, where the emphasis is on the sum and characteristics of the interactions.

> A network is defined as the totality of all the units connected by a certain type of relationship. A network has definite boundaries and is not egocentric. It subsumes all the activity fields of the constituent units; or to turn this around, the activity field of each unit encompasses some portion of the total network.....I would like to reserve the term field to indicate an egocentric system. A field may be delineated by social, economic, political or other type of relationships... Thus an activity field of any given individual or group consists of all the units with which that individual or group maintains a certain type of relationship.[3]

While both meanings are concerned with structure and interactions within a certain type of relation, one specifies an egocentric entity, a field, with a particular group or individual looking out from the center, while the other denotes the sum of the fields within a certain place or type of relationship. This serves to differentiate the focus of the outside social scientist from the inside operator. In this study it is a particularly useful distinction because our method is such that we have to begin by exploring individual patterns of interaction and reciprocity, but our final emphasis will be on the total network in each school. It is reasonable and useful to reserve the term field to refer to the former, network to refer to the latter.

There is a second important distinction we wish to make and that concerns the importance of a "type of relationship" referred to by Jay. What Jay has in mind is additional categorical concepts indicating type of relation, i.e. social, economic, political which will serve to lodge

specific actions in specific places and may be used to fill out the description and analysis of the data. But what many social scientists have in mind when they use the term network is a structure with its points and lines, dyadic relations, mesh and density which per se serve as the independent variables affecting behavior. As such, the term network by itself is neither ego centered nor is the described action within a network to be predicated on an additional conceptual framework, social, political or economic. The issue is whether the concept of network alone, with its characteristics, is sufficient to explain behavior or whether an additional conceptual framework is needed.

The concentration for many social scientists is on the linkages between people and collectivities, the arrangement of dyadic relations, how the behavior of individuals depends on their position in those relations and how the individual qualities effect the relations. The relation as such may be any kind of socially meaningful entity, e.g. role, kinship, or group, but the emphasis is on the structural regularities and the effects of those regularities on behavior, not on the relationship per se. The task of these social scientists is to "Pay attention to the network...to the geometry of its arrangement, and not to the characteristics of things that net describes."[4]

This admonition is directly in keeping with the major theme in social anthropology. "The social phenomena we observe in any human society are not the immediate result of the nature of individual human beings, but are the result of the social structure by which they are united."[5] The goal is to move beyond the concept of network as a mere metaphor or abstract image; "it is not possible to build effective explanatory theories using metaphors"[6] to focus on the ties in the structure rather than the individual qualities of people, time and place, and

hence to improve the precision specificity and predictability of theories of structure. In these processes the units are dyads, the methods survey, and the analysis is stated in terms of graph theory.

As White, Boorman and Brieger point out those such as Barnes and Bott who combine structural and categorical concepts see

> Network at best as an eclectic bag of techniques for studying the details of individual variability around some basic ordering by categories and concrete organizations. We would like the reader to entertain instead the idea that the presently existing largely categorical descriptions of social structure have no solid theoretical grounding; furthermore network concepts may provide the only way to construct a theory of social structure.[7]

Their point is that when one calls in additional categories or sets of categories to assist in analyzing and explaining particular data, he is not furthering the ends of social science. According to them the major problem with social theory since Durkheim, Tonnies and Weber is that it remains wedded to categorical imagery and primitive terms such as role, group, society, interaction and status and the "relationship of these categories to the structure remains tenuous." They further suggest the some recent studies by Coleman, Jencks and Menzel indicate that it is not concrete categories, but the structure in which one finds himself that determines his behavior.

We agree that when the conceptual explanatory model is composed of primitive categorical concepts and structural or, in this case, network concepts, the imprecision of the former does not assist in an assessment of whether an individual piece of behavior can be explained in terms of the social-psychological categories or by the network or structure. White et al. are correct. Such an eclectic explanation does not assist in progressing toward greater precision and specificity of the structural terms. When one is unable to explain behavior in consistent

terms he is similarly unable to advance the knowledge of how structure affects behavior. However, the problem with that is not only that one's position in a structure may not be sufficient to explain his behavior but also the tying of mathematical definitions and postulates to structural constructs, while giving precision and power "to the theory tend to over-simplify it. For reasons of mathematical convenience, one has to make simple assumptions which so restrict the theory that it may seem unrealistic compared to the complexity observed in human behavior."[8]

For that reason while making social relations and social structures, per se, into an explanatory model remains a goal, most network studies have been of specific places such as factories, communities, families or professional groups and the community-ness, conjugal-ness, factory-ness and professional-ness as well as concepts such as role, group status, serve as additional explanatory paradigms. These lodge the action in specific times and places making the ensuing explanation more plausable, but necessarily reducing the power of the structural paradigm to explain the action. While such a strategy may not really move the term network beyond a metaphorical stage it is generally supported by the oft-quoted Barnes:

> There is no such thing as a theory of social networks; perhaps there never will be. The basic idea behind both the metaphorical and the analytic uses of social networks - that the configuration of cross-cutting interpersonal bonds is in some unspecified way causally connected with the actions of these persons and with the social institutions of their society - remains a basic idea and nothing more. It constitutes what Homans calls an "orienting statement" rather than a theory with propositions that can be tested. Only when we postulate a specific form of connection between individuals, institutions, behavior and networks can we generate testable propositions.[9]

Later Barnes explains that graph theory is a set of logically interconnected tautologies and does not supply a theory of social

relations. Barnes own efforts have combined with not only network analysis but some sort of social psychological relational concepts.

> The study of networks is not tied closely to any particular view of social action but can be used with any theory that sees social behavior as the outcome of a multiplicity of partly conflicting social pressures on units that have interests of their own and are able to choose among alternative courses of action. What sort of interests, what pressures, what sort of calculus of choices - these are not predetermined by the use of networks.[10]

Hence, the efforts supported by Barnes are those of combining the structural network paradigm with some sort of relational concepts. "Networks seem to fit well with an exchange theory of social relations and to provide a check against the analysis of social life in purely dyadic terms."[11]

For a specific example we may turn to some of Barnes' discussion of his much quoted "Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish." In this study designed to consider "all the various ways in which members of a society interact with each other," and giving the major emphasis on the concept of network, he still feels free to discuss his data in terms such as this:

> Here I think we are dealing with a principle of fairly wide application. People living and working together inevitably have conflicting interests but in general they have also a common interest in the maintenance of existing social relations. Individual goals must be attained through socially approved processes and as far as possible the illusion must be maintained that each individual is acting only in the best interests of the community.[12]

Barnes feels free to refer to conflict, group, harmony and even implies exchange theory in his discussion and analysis of the data. He maintains the idea of network as an "orienting concept" and a useful metaphor but does not even try to explain behavior in terms of structure. Rather, structure is the result of basic social and psychological processes

operationalized through human behavior, the result being a network that reflects the former operationalized through the latter. Brown would agree:

> Human beings as individuals are objects of study for physiologists and psychologists. The human being as a person is a complex of social relationships. He is a citizen of England, a husband, a father, a bricklayer, a member of a particular methodist congregation, a voter in a certain constituency, a member of his trade union, an adherent to his labor party and so on. Note that each of these descriptions refers to a social relationship or a place in a social structure.[13]

So in his parish study Barnes noted the various memberships held by each inhabitant who is simultaneously a member of a hamlet, a ward and a parish, and perhaps a fishing crew. That these relations can be analyzed separately and that particular behaviors are appropriate each notwithstanding, these various relationships intersect each other at all levels. When each of the relational types is removed from the social picture, the image of the complex network remains, and for Barnes study, that image is what helps one understand the structure of the entire parish of 4,600 individuals.

Similarly, Elizabeth Bott in her Family and Social Network described the diverse conjugal roles carried out within each family and the degree of connectedness among families. She suggested that the former, e.g., the segregation of role relationship within a family, varied directly with the latter, e.g., the connectedness of the family's social network. She indicated that the term network was particularly useful as juxtaposed to the term group, some of the families forming a tight knit unit in which their friends were also friends, while for other families there was little or no connectedness among friends. One might envision the concept of ethnicity being brought in to help explain such a situation but Bott who sees a network as standing between a family and

the total environment preferred to say that "variations in network connectedness cannot be explained in terms of any single factor. Such variations are made possible by the complexity and variability of the economic occupational and other institutional systems that create a a complex of forces affecting families in different ways and permitting selection and choice by the family."[14]

Charles Loomis in his "Grouping in a Spanish American Village," used the basic network units, nodes indicating people and links indicating relations, to map out the culture of a Spanish speaking village in New Mexico.[15] His final unit, the village as a maze of relations from family to acquaintances, constituted a normative society with the whole intermeshed into one informal network. While the network is a useful way to think of the village which by its size is more than a group and more than simply a gemeinschaft, still the concepts of family and nonfamily are called on to fill out the qualitative relationships within the net.

Loomis' families had been in that town for some years prior to the study but A.L. Epstein in his "Network and Urban Social Organization" studies the town of Ndola in the African copper belt which because of its attractiveness to laborers had drawn most of its inhabitants very recently. His study noted that in this area of great mobility...

> despite the continuous coming and going of people the apparent ease with which strangers to the town are able to discover their friends and kinfolk or husbands and wives to trace their deserting spouses. The fact is that each individual African is involved in a network of social ties which ramify throughout the urban community and extend to other towns and tribal areas.[16]

This network is what gives some social order to the processes of the town. Indeed at a certain point one may say that the town is only an administrative abstraction, the networks among the inhabitants was what made the human society in Ndola. Indeed this is what Barnes meant by an internal urban social network.

D. M. Boswell in his "Personal Crises and the Mobilization of the Social Network" used the same paradigm as Epstein and Loomis, that of social network in an urban African area and demonstrated how a personal crisis was an occasion for the calling of the network into existence.[17] This action was based on common tribal affiliation but in the town centered around some leading religious figures. The religious figures served almost as a repository for tribal kinship affiliations and on the occasion of crisis the latter relations were activated in the former, allowing the religious ties to emerge as the enduring affiliations in the urban society. Boswell pointed out that the concept of network then was able to encompass both the general structure of informal relationships and the associational and institutional structure and had the flexibility for an analysis of the transition.

We may contrast those approaches to White et al, quoted earlier whose position is that:

> social structure is regularities in the patterns of relations among concrete entities by their attributes. To describe social structure we must aggregate those regularities in a fashion consistent with their inherent nature as networks. The cultural and socio-psychological meanings of actual ties are largely bypassed in the development. We focus instead on interpreting the patterns among ties found in block models. Our sole assumption here is that all ties of a given type share a common signification.[18]

But one of the problems with assuming that "all ties of a shared type share a common type of signification" is that, as Boorman and White admit in a later article, types of tie lead to the concept of role interlock.[19]

But in studies of networks extending through large populations, and our study is one of these, the people with whom one works are not those to whom he is related, are not those with whom he recreates and so on. Each individual is likely to have a field which is extended chain-like, with the separate links not ever coming back onto one another and role interlock never developing. It is characterized more by its lack of density and lack of interlock than by anything else. With such an arrangement, it is hard to defend attributing behavior simply to patterns of dyadic interaction without taking additional information into consideration, information which will be expressed in categorical terms.

We have attempted to explain the differences in perspective between those who are content to leave the term network as a metaphor and those who would move it to the position of an independent variable. In this study designed to describe the networks that exist among staffs of secondary schools, our field or naturalistic approach places us with the former position. Involved as we were with watching and listening to interactions all over the schools, we had to make numerous individual judgements about what to observe and record.

Our judgements were based on two considerations. The first was the question of whether the interaction had anything to do with the curriculum per se, the second was whether the interaction had anything to do with the generalized behavior of a person(s) in the school. We could be careful about the obvious curricular interactions, but so many of the interactions we observed were of little apparent relevance to the curriculum, but had a great deal to do with the general pattern of behavior that individual(s) had evolved in the school. In this latter category we were constantly making judgements about the importance of interactions,

and not only brought in the concept of teacher-ness, but also group-ness, reciprocal friendships and even conflict. The resultant description is laced with judgements phrased in terms of categories of this or that piece of interaction and since we interjected these categories into the description via our on-the-spot judgements, so we will call them up in our analysis.

Thus in every phase of the study, we have followed the model of Mitchell, Barnes and Bott, Loomis and Epstein and avoided the model of White, Granvetter, Leinhart and Boorstein. Our units were not always dyads, the judgement about the inclusion of the unit described was made on reasons not always structural, and the categories called into description will be extended in the analysis. We find no problem with this, but we do feel obligated to make it clear in the beginning what is involved in our presentation. Of course that means that our analysis will consist of a mixed bag of primitive terms and in no sense will that analysis be generalizable into laws, but that was not our original intent. The intent was to describe, to lodge the description in a specific environment, to generate heuristic theory for others to use in thinking about networks in secondary schools, and perhaps to help formulate some testable hypotheses. And indeed with such an effort, while it may appear to lack vigor, it is in the mainstream of social science research.

However, along side our description and analysis, we will also juxtapose in terms of the generalized description, possible alternatives to the described behavior. Our reasoning is thus: The type of explanation we have outlined and will follow is susceptible to the general criticism of functional explanation. That is by the process of calling on various

categorical terms, we will be setting up certain patterns of behavior as natural and we will be implying an almost causal relationship between the general premises behind the category and the described behavior. The implication will be left that what we described could not have been otherwise given those general premises. "The explanatory import of the whole argument lies in showing that the outcome described in the explanandum (our description) is to be expected in view of the antecedents, circumstances and general laws listed in the explanands."[20] When we bring in reciprocity theory or role or conflict theory to help explain some piece of described behavior, then the implicit assumption will be that the behavior was inevitable given the behaviors implicit in the theory. "When a neurotic trait in an adult is psychoanalytically explained by reference to critical childhood experiences the argument explicitly or implicitly claims that the case at hand is but an exemplification of certain general laws governing the development of neuroses."[21]

In effect our choice is to go with the inclusion of certain categorical concepts to help explain our choice of behaviors to record, and to similarly help with the filling out of the analysis makes us susceptible to this common danger implicit in functional or teleological explanations, the implicit assertion of a causal relationship between the explanation implied in the categorical term and the behavior. The resultant message is that the behavior could not have been otherwise.

Again we are left with the criticism stated by the structuralists, that the results of such studies are seductively plausible, but without scientific value. Our answer is taking Hemphill's lead more directly: "The idea of functionalism for example might be construed as expressing a directive for inquiry, namely to search for specific self-regulatory

aspects of social and other systems and to examine the ways in which various traits of a system might contribute to its particular mode of self regulation."[22] In effect the research may be valued for its heuristic effects, for the theory generating value. And to accentuate those outcomes, we will attempt to eschew the strict functional explanation, and following Merton will also suggest how things might have been different given the same set of circumstances. In addition we will also look for behaviors by other teachers which are different from those generalized. In doing so we will avoid the implications and problems with functional analysis.

Summary

Our intent in this study is to describe and explain the network of relations among professional staffs of two secondary schools. As we explained there are two major lines of thought running through network research. The first position is that network, as an abstract concept, is analygous to the term group, kinship, tribe or gemeinshaft. It denotes a social unit, has some generally understood properties such as density and extension, indicates a sort of social structure and most important for the researcher provides an intelligible starting point for researching some specific place such as a school. We know what we mean by the term network but the characteristics are stated in negative terms. It is not a family because it does not have the defined blood relation. It is less than a group because it lacks the equilibrium and face to face contact among all parties, it is not an administrative structure lacking the formal roles and rules and regulations, it is not a gemeinshaft lacking the normativeness, it is not a city, being less administratively formal and more ego-centric, and it is not a tribe or nation, being

probably smaller as well as less formal. Its popularity can be attributed to the demographic fact of large, mobile populations in an open society. It is a useful term, as some of the African researchers indicate because it gives one a way to talk about a society that is larger and less defined than a family or tribe, but smaller and more personal than the larger administrative units and organizations in which we work. It fits well in a society where people play very diverse roles and the roles do not interlock. One has his family, his kinship group, his work or recreational group, his administrative or corporate affiliations, but these do not intersect one another except through him. Hence it cannot be said that he is heavily involved in some identifieble unit as one could say of a villager in western Ireland, or a group of Jewish immigrants in New York City or Swedish pioneers in South Dakota. Of course, the personal ties of family and kin and friends are still maintained everywhere, but, in general, one's professional or political, even recreational ties, lie outside those small affective groups. What we have is a society where one's separate affiliations parallel one another. The concept of network, or perhaps field in this case, gives us an intelligible way to talk about personal life in a large and mobile open society.

The second and related reason for the popularity of the term is that in combining the personal aspects with administrative or bureaucratic characteristics, it supports the major line of organizational research combining the sociological with the psychological perspective:

> knowledge can best be advanced by research which attempts to deal simultaneously with data at different levels of abstraction--individual, group, and organization. This is a difficult task, and the outcome is not uniformly satisfactory. It is, nevertheless, a core requirement for understanding human organizations. Organizations are reducible to individual human acts; yet they are lawful and in part understandable only at the level of collective behavior. This duality of level, which is the essence of human

> organization as it is of social psychology, we have attempted to recognize in our theoretical model and in our research design. Our hope is that the effort and its product may contribute to the understanding of organized human behavior. We know of no more urgent problem.[23]

But, of course, as we explain the advantages and appeal of the term, it does not meet the expectations put out by Leinhart, White, Boorstein etc. who limit their explanations to structural terms. We have already indicated that for our own reasons, both theoretical and methodological, we will not align ourselves with their efforts. In fact, in our efforts, we will include under this network study the categories indicating personal or psychological terms, such as reciprocity, with social relational terms, such as network and group, along with institutional concepts denoted by the formal school organization. Our own effort combines three levels of abstraction: the personal, the social and the institutional. Included in our account will be the social characteristics influencing the link, the link, and then the environmental characteristics influencing the link. While this will not lead to the formulation of law-like propositions for testing in empirical terms, it is in keeping with a long tradition of social science and, according to Weber, at least is in the mainstream of social science research:

> Laws are important and valuable in the exact natural sciences in the measure that those sciences are universally valid. For the knowledge of historical phenomena in their concreteness, the most general laws because they are devoid of content are also the least valuable. The more comprehensive the validity or scope of a term, the more it leads us away from the richness of reality since in order to include the common elements of the largest possible number of phenomena, it must necessarily be as abstract as possible and hence devoid of content. In cultural sciences, the knowledge of the universal or general is never valuable in itself.[24]

And indeed, the advantage of our efforts is not only the account of networks, but, more importantly, the study of secondary schools. Our primary interest

is not so much in the strict social sciences, as in learning more about the practical matters of American public education. So while we will heed the methodological and theoretical principles of the social sciences, our support and our profession as public educators demands that this be primarily an account of life in schools. The success of our efforts will be the value of the account to other educators more than to social scientists.

The Concept of Networks as Applied to Schools

Our first task was to state the purpose, establish the concept of network and demonstrate by reference to the literature, the particular stance we were taking toward the concept. In general our effort will be in that line of network research which does not presume to move the concept beyond a metaphor. But while our intent is to emphasize the "educational" aspects of the term rather than give the term added theoretical power, we believe that the concept alone, as it could be applied to schools, may be better than any metaphor we are presently using.

> As Schon (1977) has pointed out, the ways that individuals frame social problems depends on the metaphors they use, either explicitly or implicitly in their analysis of these problems. These "generative metaphors" such as the school as an industrial factory suggest that the problems and solutions are intimately linked. Hence if we see schools as in trouble, and if we use a metaphor which suggests schools are like factories, we may wish to examine the raw inputs to schools, the technological processes involved in creating the product and the response of the market to the product. In this frame coordination, control and facilitation take on mechanistic attributes. In this metaphor, these concepts suggest that a hierarchy of experts are able to generate standard operating procedures for handling production problems.[25]

But a plethora of writers during the past few years have pointed out that thinking about schools as factories or rational, means-end organizations where elements are causally related and the causal relations

are traceable was not very productive. The reason was not the recalcitrance of school people to reform their behavior but rather lies with a mistaken notion of schools as factories. What points this up is the recent popularity of adding the hermeneutical perspective to any analysis. This additional perspective takes the mode of analysis, per se, as the subject of a deeper analysis and consists of "searches for the first principles of a critical or emancipatory science that can respond in a contemporary manner to the methodology of the established social sciences."[26] The advocates of this critical theory base their approach on the following points: (1) Knowledge is not inherently neutral, (2) there is no unitary scientific method and (3) the standards for exactness and certainty in the physical sciences are not the only standards for scientific knowledge. Rather they believe that while the established social sciences are used primarily as tools for technical certainty and social control, a social science based on critical theory should be "capable of analyzing the necessity of historical modes of authority and should presuppose an interest in the emancipation of individuals...from social control."[27] Their hope is for a methodology which will include a "critical theory of knowledge internal to its theory of society."[28] This critical theory of knowledge or analysis of theory is the hallmark of the hermeneutical approach, the central tenet of which is that one must force himself into an awareness that the mode of analysis he uses to approach a problem will have a foregoing effect on his judgement and will restrict the ability of that judgement to solve any particular issue.

In other words the critics of schools attack not only the schools, but they criticize equally the way we think about the schools and the

repressive implications of our thinking.

> The most critical aspect of U.S. capitalism is that a few people own and control the bulk of productive resources, while most--aside from personal possessions--own only their labor power. The U.S. economy exhibits the most extensive and complete wage-labor system in the history of civilization. This system, which emerged historically as a progressive force in the service of economic productivity and the ethos of individuality and personal freedom, has long become repressive and anachronistic, an obstacle to further human progress.
>
> The educational system, basically, neither adds to nor subtracts from the degree of inequality and repression originating in the economic sphere. Rather, it reproduces and legitimates a preexisting pattern in the process of training and stratifying the work force.[29]

The criticisms are of both schools and the factory or rational bureaucratic metaphor, which takes as its underlying assumption that the ideal state for students is as passive recipients of a technological training designed to make them into some desired product. The educational goals are prescribed by technological demands and the school is bound by the laws of economic efficiency. Such laws posit the critical aspects of schooling as those that are replicable, quantifiable and discernible. This paradigm of education constitutes an economist's view of the world and implies that the basic questions to be asked about education and knowledge are economic and utilitarian in nature.[30] Such criticism seems quite radical to professional school people, but it is not only the radicals who criticize the schools in these terms. A Presidential Committee of Educators noted that:

> The young are set apart, and their apartness is characterized by dependency. A longer time in school, by year and day, is a longer time in a dependent state of peculiar qualities. The diffuse dependency found in relation to parents is replaced by the specialized dependency found in the relation of clients to professionals and bureaucrats. At the same time, the dependency is not optional and limited, as client relations commonly are, but is required and involves a repetitive round of movement from one expert to another that is prolonged over many years. The

> student role has become preeminently one of segmental relation to specialists in a setting of bureaucratic procedures. Growing professional competence on top of increased administrative authority renders teachers more dominant and in control. Perhaps a basic characteristic of the school as a social system nearly everywhere is that the student role is essentially passive.[31]

There are two points: The first is that it is not only dissatisfaction with schools, it is a dissatisfaction with schools as rational means-end organizations that we are noting. The second point is that it not only the romanticists such as Kozol, Kohl and Holt, and some Marxists who are voicing the dissatisfaction; it is people such as those who get appointed to presidential committees who are equally dissatisfied with schools and with our ways of thinking about them. Not only do they want different schools, but they also want different ways of thinking about schools.[32]

Several organizational theorists have identified educational organizations as having soft technology, and hence having a number of unique characteristics. Thompson contrasts these organizations to those which have a "hard technology and which have a high degree of technical rationality with a system of cause effect relationship which lead to a desired result...it is instrumentally perfect when it becomes a closed system of logic which contains all relevant variables and only relevant variables. But..."the technology of education rests on abstract systems of belief about relationships among teachers, teaching materials and pupils...learning theorists assume to presume the presence of these variables and proceed from that point."[33] While we do not know that a truly closed system is only a useful abstraction, unrealizable in the social world, schools are not even relatively closed. Not only are the cause and effect relationships between processes and products unclear,

but there are present an unlimited number of exogenous variables. Community sentiments, the differential ability of students and a high degree of teacher autonomy, are almost uncontrollable. Using an industrial or bureaucratic metaphor, with their assumptions of closedness, to try to discuss such a system seems inappropriate. With his emphasis on heterogeneous task environments, organizational as opposed to technical rationality, the problems of boundary spanning in organizations with soft technologies, change in technologically soft organizations, and the problems of reducing uncertainty when faced with a plethora of exogenous variables, Thompson provides a more accurate way to discuss educational organizations.

Similarly Weick's concept of "loosely coupled" has a strong common sense appeal to observers of schools. It states that unlike organizations in which events are closely linked, where greater numbers of prerequisites are required for each event and where the technology is "hard", a loosely coupled organization is characterized by "the image that coupled events are responsive but that each event also preserves its own identity and some evidence of logical separateness." Thus in the case of an educational organization, it may be that the counselor's office is loosely coupled with the principal's office. The image is that the principal and the counselor are somehow attached, but that each retains some identity and separateness and that their attachment may be circumspect, infrequent, weak in its mutual effects, unimportant or slow to respond.[34] Some additional characteristics of a loosely coupled structure are where (1) influence is slow to spread, (2) there is causal independence, (3) a confusion of means and ends, (4) an absence of linkages which would be present if the system were more rational, (5) unresponsiveness of

components to influences or directives, a lack of coordination, and (6) an absence of supervision.

In our opinion there is some compelling evidence that schools are loosely coupled and that the metaphor is accurate. Some of the evidence consists of a number of detailed studies which describe concentrated attempts by some administrators to impose a more rational organizational model on schools, and the reaction of the staff to those models. The models seem to be characterized by (1) an emphasis on the cognitive rather than the affective, (2) a clear distinction between means and ends, (3) an emphasis on individual achievement as opposed to the adherence to communal norms, (4) on the alternation of means in order to maximize the returns, and (5) an emphasis on efficiency and the belief that change is good. And in each of the cases which we will cite, those attempts were overwhelmingly rejected by the teachers. Reporting on an attempt by the former superintendent, administrators and board in Kalamazoo, Michigan to impose an accountability model on the teachers and evaluate those teachers based on their performance in that system, Patton and Perrone report:

> ...teachers feel the accountability system is largely ineffective and inadequate. Ninety percent of the teachers disagree with the school administration's published statement that "the Kalamazoo accountability system is designed to personalize and individualize education." Eighty-eight percent report that the system does not assist teachers to become more effective. Ninety percent responded that the accountability system has not improved educational planning in Kalamazoo. Ninety-three percent believe that "accountability as practiced in Kalamazoo created an undesirable atmosphere of anxiety among the teachers." Ninety percent assert that the "accountability system is mostly a public relations effort."[35]

And in his Teachers vs. Technocrats, Wolcott reported the same type of response to administrators' attempts to implement a variation of PPBS into the teacher's planning, teaching, evaluations routine. In fact,

the problems, political and emotional, that arose from that effort were far more devastating to the district than could have been warranted by any good that might have come from the rational management model.[36] One more example of teacher rejection of management models which attempts to "tightly couple" an otherwise loosely coupled system was reported by Charles Clinton for the NIE sponsored "Experimental Schools Project." Briefly the system asked teachers to:

> administer tests that purported to diagnose student abilities. Teachers and students then followed management systems or subject matter outlines that arranged materials in a hierarchy of difficulty and prescribed specific assignments that would correct individual skill deficiencies. Each prescription had a variety of learning material, some of which were audio, others of which were either visual or text.[37]

Diagnosing, developing, testing, prescribing, implementing and accounting were the key elements in the program, but the response of the teachers to these was at best lukewarm. They complained, were skeptical, manipulated their own responses for requests for information to control the system in their favor and generally dragged their feet throughout theinnovation. The superintendent asked that they enthusiastically endorse the program by changing their mode of classroom operation, but it was apparently too much for them and they did not do it.

> Acceptance was not complete. Behaviors had changed, attitudes had not. The middle school teacher had a student able to read at a minimal level. The student asked for permission to listen to a set of tapes that explained the printing of an illustrated book. The teacher refused. The child immediately went from place to place disturbing working students each stop. The teacher threatened the student with physical punishment. While teachers might try new ways of dealing with students, they always returned to tradition...the teacher as lecturer and the student as passive audience.[38]

In each of these three cases, Kalamazoo, the NIE Study and Wolcott's work, the attempt to rationalize the educational processes and to tie the technology of schooling into a tighter and more controllable model

not only met with teacher reaction that ranged from foot-dragging recalcitrance to outright defiance, but each time the controversy was taken into the political arena and made into an unpleasant conflict involving the politics of the board of education. In fact, each time, the matter of instructional process became secondary to the matter of control over classroom processes.

It appeared a few years ago that these attempts to rationalize educational processes would become more and more frequent, but the lessons of these and other places have not been lost on school administrators. In fact, in a study undertaken for the NIE-sponsored Institute for Reasearch on Teaching in which we attempted to uncover the values and beliefs of classroom teachers that might be opposed to the values and beliefs of administrators who have publicly identified themselves with a more rational perspective, we could find only twelve administrators in the state of Michigan whom we could identify with those attempts. Many advocated tighter control and spoke of greater rationality and a more unified means-end continuum but only twelve were publicly committed to a specific program. Even in the larger, better-financed districts, the central office administrators spoke with considerable wariness about imposing such models.[39] It may be that the PPBS's, MBO's, PERT's, and CEPM's have run their course.

There are some studies which support the notion that the defiance of teachers to those technological-type efforts are quite understandable given their sense of the realities of the organizations. Lortie reports that when teachers were asked to describe a "good day," their responses indicated:

> Positive events and outcomes are linked to two sets of actors--the teacher and the students. (Students occasionally produce

> negative references connected with discipline cases.) But all other persons, without exception were connected with undesirable occurrences. Negative allusions were made to parents, the principal, the school nurse, colleagues - in fact, anyone and everyone who "intrudes" on classroom events. The cathected scene is stripped of all transactions save those between teacher and students.[40]

It appears that what the teachers studied wanted was the preservation of a system that gave them considerable autonomy. What they rejected were those elements of the school which asked that they "work more closely with" teachers, administrators, supervisors, counselors, etc. Those who advocate coordination of effort are assuming that greater productivity will result from this "working with." But as Lortie's report suggests, and as Weick's outline of a theory supports, teachers just do not seem to believe that schools and education are organized like that and attempts to change their behavior may cause more trouble than it is worth.

There are two studies of secondary administrators which support the idea of secondary schools as very loosely structured organizations. The first by Cusick and Peters is one in which we interviewed thirty-five principals of small town high schools to gather information on that role.[41] We concluded that that role is severely constrained by school policies, teacher tenure and the contract, but most importantly by the diverseness and isolation of the activities constituting the curriculum and the diverseness and isolation of the people who constitute the staff. From the information, we inferred that there really was no overall coordination or plan or underlying rationality to the curriculum. Subjects never spoke in terms of the "goals" or "product," the "planning" or "evaluating," nor did they ever speak of the "staff" or "faculty," and indeed they used no term that could lead one to infer that they were the instrumental leaders of some identifiable organized unit.

In another study of the behavior of managers of educational institutions, Lee Sproul reported that the activities of these managers whom she studied were characterized by extreme choppiness, (an average length was five minutes) that the interactions and activities seemed unconnected with one another, that they were primarily oral with whatever written policy existed being ignored or changed to fit the occasion, and that the activities were quite unpredictable. But what was most surprising was, she reported that the managers spent only four percent of their time attending to matters that could be roughly described as having to do with the teaching and learning.[42] Certainly this suggests that educational organizations may be less than rational; subsequently, Weick's concept of "loose coupling" becomes considerably more attractive.

There are a few studies of students in secondary schools which support our ideas. Inside High School described the adolescent groups that he studied as having little or nothing to do with the formal goals of the school but as exerting tremendous time demands on the students. That is, students seemed to spend the major part of their days engaged in small group processes talking about sports, cars, guns and the opposite sex, but never about school, grades, learning or anything remotely resembling academic achievement. The groups did have some effect on the formal organization and its goals, but most of that effect was negative. That is, their informal interactions took away time that might have been used for pursuit of learning, or in a minimal maintenance sense, they reminded one or another group member what time he had to be in what place or how long (or how short) a particular assignment had to be.[43]

Synthesizing that study with some other studies of student behavior, Cusick, Palonsky and Martin concluded that the secondary school organizations

in which the studied behavior took place:

> (1) lacked vitality, (2) had only limited ability to control or change the behavior that goes on inside them and (3) were unable to recognize and admit diversity or conflict, and instead were forced to resort to a uniformity imposed by authoritarian control. To say that the schools lacked vitality is to say that they resembled a "department store on Saturday afternoon," containing an aggregate of individuals who have some generally similar purpose for coming under the same roof, and who, while there, tacitly agree to maintain some kind of order but without forming among themselves any internal organization, cohesiveness or communal attitude. It might be very well for a school to have a "department store on Saturday" type of organization. After all, education can be considered an individually obtained product. But there are some problems with that lack of community. Specifically, the staff of such organizations may have great difficulty achieving more than minimal control over the behavior of the organization's members and may have great difficulty changing that behavior.[44]

Our concept of a secondary school organization as a "department store on Saturday afternoon" is very similar to Weick's loosely coupled structure" in that both denote an organization in which there are many semi-autonomous parts, low interdependence, little discernible relationship between the processes and the product, a soft technology, a low and non-interfering supervisory technique and a similarly low level of vertical integration.

Summary

In the preceeding pages we have discussed the problems of finding apt metaphors with which to discuss schools. A metaphor is a useful device. It gives one a theoretical grasp of a situation, a means of synthesizing out the essence of the parts and the relationships, and a way of formulating solutions to problems. To date the favored metaphor for schools, as for most organizations, has been that of the rational means-ends model with the school likened to a factory or bureaucracy having clear inputs, detailed lines of authority, overt application of processes to products, discernible and measureable outcomes,

and clear evaluation procedures. But it has not worked. The evidence for this conclusion is taken from descriptions of attempts to apply the model and solutions inherent in the model to problems phrased in terms of the model.

Not only have the problems not been solved, the model has not even been capable of phrasing the problems. In fact, the very phrasing of the problems in those terms has led to controversies over value differences that themselves are outside the scope of the model. So despite its intuitive appeal, we do not seem to be able to gain a theoretical or practical grasp of schools using the rational model. The evidence from our studies show that the phrasing of the problems in those terms is likely to cause more problems than the model is capable of addressing. While the model did apply when the postwar boom demanded construction of buildings, hiring of teachers, consolidating districts and developing the educational superstructure, our present concerns, learning skills, quality instruction, sound career choices, equity and normative compliance from staff seem to defy phrasing in those terms. Now the concerns are the human-qualitative activities that take place within the superstructure, and further use of the rational metaphor does not seem to aply.

What does seem to apply at least theoretically is a more sophisticated language which explains schools as being loosely coupled organizations with independent and autonomous parts, a low degree of internal coordination and a soft technology. The latter term means that the parts and the interrelations of those parts are both indeterminate and hence elude one's ability to control or alter them. But there are two problems with that model. The first is that while it has some intelligent insights into the structure, it has nothing to say about the internal processes such as equity, quality and learning that people want to address. The

second is that it carries an almost functional implication that things are as they should be and indeed no amount of tinkering is likely to make them better. As such it almost gives a tacit approval to a redundant system which may protect incompetence, where divisions of labor may overlap, and where there is confusion of functions. Critics of the loosely coupled, soft technology model argue that it is absurd to think of each teacher inventing his own curriculum, that not everyone is to be trusted to exercise autonomy; that pockets of incompetence are going undiscovered, and important goals are not being achieved. So while we have a useful and perhaps accurate theoretical language with which to discuss schools, we do not merely want to discuss schools, we want some guides to action, and the loosely coupled metaphor does not seem to help.

That is why, despite the problems with the rational metaphor, despite the evidence that when applied to classroom processes it may cause more problems than it addresses, and despite the theoretical appeal of the "soft technology loosely coupled metaphor," we still revert to that rational bureaucratic metaphor. Even when our efforts are misplaced, its appealing simplicity offers us concrete suggestions for action. It is still the most popular metaphor among those who want to "improve" schools through the implementation of some program. As an aside, we might point out that our main problem may be the schizoid nature of the endeavor. On the one hand, we are trying to develop an intelligent way to describe schools in theoretical terms, but we have to do so in such a way as to satisfy the public school policy makers to whom anything less than a clear mandate for action is simple idle intellectualism. But they too are in a schizoid position trying to satisfy the dictums of management which have something to do with efficient use of resources,

while they are subject to endless pushing and pulling from conflicting constituencies. We will have to address these points in our analysis.

The question we want to address here is whether the "network" concept can offer any hope for an action-oriented metaphor. May we expect that using that concept will combine the theoretical appeal of the loosely coupled model with the action appeal of the rational model? May we expect the concept and a possible model that arises from the concept to give us that in-principle control over educational processes in the classroom? Will it help us find that guide to action which will appeal both to the analysts with their academic approach to schools, and to teachers and administrators who want to solve practical problems?

We believe that it has advantages over the loosely coupled metaphor. It seems to us that the concept of network offers a good way to look at how people make decisions in schools. We will assume that decisions are made within some psychological framework, some set of givens. As Simon points out, individuals need some set of givens in which to make decisions about how to behave because, if left completely autonomous, their choices would be so great as to make "any semblance of rational choice an impossibility ."[45] The concept offers insight into those sets of regular interactions and we will assume that the structure of those interactions is roughly coterminous with the set of psychological givens within which decisions are made.

The structure of the network then can represent the structure of the givens. Since the structure of any organization, as Perrow points out, is also likely to be the policy of the organization we will not only be describing how people make decisions, but the curriculum that

emerges as a result of those decisions. As the loosely coupled theory indicates, the parts of the school are semi-independent and each may be operating within its own set of constraints. As we watch the individual parts, so we will be watching the processes for formulating the curriculum. Then, too, with the division of the term into one area or "field," which is egocentric, and the second "network," the sum of the egocentric fields, we will even better be able to take the autonomy of the parts into consideration. In sum, we believe that the concept of network has some advantages over the concept of loosely coupled.

The next question, of course, is whether the concept of metaphor has any potential for action. If one were to stick to the structural interpretation of the term, assuming that behavior can be explained according to one's position in the structure, then the answer would be an unqualified "yes." But as we have not taken that stance, our position is that while behavior may partly be attributable to position in a structure, the structure itself is the product of basic social and psychological processes operationalized through the latter. As such, we cannot promise that if we are able to describe the interaction patterns, then a structural alteration will result in different interaction patterns. However there is some hope. The added concepts of role, conflict, and reciprocity too represent behavior patterns that can be interpreted as structural, assist in understanding the basic processes of the school. As such they can lead to some solid action suggestions. While such a mixed approach may be less than the structuralists wish, it may offer some theoretical way to formulate solutions to perceived problems. Whether it will have the emotional appeal of the closed rational model or whether it will be so complex as to give no clear direction to action, we cannot say. Our hope is that with a description that takes autonomy

and separateness into consideration, as does the network model, we can describe schools in terms that have some useful action suggestions for practitioners.

The Environment Of Public Secondary Schools

This is a descriptive study of some networks operating among staffs of two secondary schools and as such as we do not need a history of public education in order to enter the data. Since we believe in the sociological perspective that takes an environment into consideration when describing human behavior, then we will pay some initial attention to that environment. After all, everything that we describe will take place in a particular setting with very definite characteristics, characteristics which permeate the description. For that reason we want to pay some attention to describing the most important of them and to briefly examine their effects, both intended and unintended.

What we are describing is a particular mode of education characterized by a set of purposely developed characteristics. These were developed and embedded over a long period of time and are presently embedded so securely in the system and are so pervasive that no intelligent discussion of secondary schools can take place outside their context. We may be lulled into thinking that this present mode is "just the way secondary education is" and should be, but, of course, that is not the case. There are a number of other characteristics which could be conceived, could be defended with as much intelligence and rationality and could, if embedded in a system, combine into a quite different psychological environment. For that reason it is important to delineate the present set. These characteristics, as they exist, make up that psychological set referred to by organizational theorists since Simon. "Individuals

need some set of givens in which to make their decisions about how to behave. If left alone their choice would be so great as to make "Any semblance of rational choice an impossibility." [46] The characteristics that are embedded in the system are synonymous with those organizational givens. With the structure of secondary schools as it is, it makes sense to do certain things, but not other things. Even when alternatives are educationally sound, they seldom get seriously considered unless they fit the givens. For these reasons it is important to delineate that set.

Our system of public secondary education in the United States is characterized by its tax supported base which began as early as 1812 in New York, its compulsory-ness which started in Massachusetts in 1852 and its tenet is that the primary or local district is free to offer as diversified a curriculum to students of all ages as it wishes. This latter was established by the Kalamazoo act of 1874 and reflects a local autonomy that itself is a strong characteristic which, as Conant pointed out..."can be related to our pioneer history, parish and county autonomy in the south, the seventeenth century independence of New England church congregations and a suspicion of centralized government..." all of which contributed to local autonomy.[47]

At the turn of the century our system of free compulsory K-12 education was basically in place and ready to respond to the demand for assimilation of immigrants, training of workers and the maintenance of basic standards of morality. According to Callahan's well-known theses, the emphasis on business and the business ethic that pervaded the country in the first part of the century was responsible for the infusion of vocational or practical education, the deemphasis on academic education and for the implementation of the platoon system

or Gary Plan by which large numbers of adolescents were "batched" through the school each day and subjected to various subject matter specialists. But also according to Callahan, the damaging part was the infusion of the business ethic into the running of schools. The ethic carried with it the popularizing of education, making school administrators subject to the popular conception of efficiency, subverting educational quality by emphasizing efficiency and per pupil cost and accepting the model of scientific management for analyzing and evaluating schools. According to his theses our reliance on the factory or rational bureaucratic model is a result of its pervasiveness throughout the whole social system. Indeed, he contends that we have forgotten any other way to think about schools except in these terms and by the 1930's were no longer able to consider alternatives.

> It is possible that if educators had sought the finest product at the lowest cost - a dictum which is sometimes claimed to be a basic premise in American manufacturing the results (of the efficiency movement) would not have been unfortunate. But the record shows that the emphasis was not at all on producing the finest product but on "the lowest cost."[48]

While Callahan's description may be accurate, there is still the question of whether the results could have been otherwise, given the conditions. But even so, for the past fifty years, the American public secondary schools have had as their basic characteristics that they are free, public, compulsory, tied to the public tax base and hence popularized, specialized and subject to the criteria of efficiency. In addition the schools are expected to achieve varied goals. The latter include the development of self development, human relationships, economic efficiency and civic responsibility. Our schools are in fact popular and secular churches. With the basic system in place, the way was open for a series of attempts to improve or reform the secondary schools. Among the more

important of these was the Conant Report of 1959, which concluded that there was a need for improved academic standards in most secondary schools, and that in many schools, there was too much emphasis on the social and athletic to the detriment of the academic. In addition to suggesting improved opportunities for the more academically inclined students, the report also suggested that the great number (17,000) of small high schools be consolidated into fewer schools (5000), each having at least 100 students per class. Conant's reasoning was that only then could the school be sufficiently large to offer a diversified curriculum to a diversified population:

> The enrollment of many American public high schools is too small to allow a diversified curriculum except at exorbitant expense. The Prevalence of such high schools--those graduating classes of less than one hundred students--constitutes one of the serious obstacles to good secondary education throughout most of the United States. I believe such schools are not in a position to provide a satisfactory education for any group of their students--the academically talented, the vocationally oriented, or the slow reader. The instructional program is neither sufficiently broad nor sufficiently challenging. A small high school cannot by its very nature offer a comprehensive curriculum.[49]

Conant's concentration was on the quality and the size of the school and curriculum. At no point did he question or challenge the basic characteristics we outlined above. "I am convinced American secondary education can be made satisfactory without any radical changes in the basic pattern" and he reaffirmed "for social reasons" the importance of maintaining of all the secondary educational programs under one roof.[50] In general his report gave an affirmative answer to the initial question "Can a school at one and the same time provide a good general education for all the pupils as future citizens of a democracy, provide elective programs for the majority to develop useful skills and educate adequately those with a talent for handling advanced academic subjects?"[51] Conant's thesis was easily phrased in the language of efficiency. The

writer remembers his first teaching job as a junior high English teacher in a 300 student K-8 elementary school. In 1963 the 7th and 8th grades from all over that city were combined into two large 7-9 junior high schools. The justification was that we were following the Conant report which suggested consolidation for purposes of efficiency.

Conant's suggestions for consolidation was timely, coinciding as it did with a nationwide need for improved and larger facilities for the increasing number of students. In Michigan it occurred at that time when there were over 4000 school districts in the state, that the city of Grand Ledge, which served 600 secondary pupils from its own district, and an additional 400 secondary students on a yearly tuition basis from surrounding districts, found itself in need of a new facility. The board informed the surrounding primary districts that unless they too assumed the burden of indebtedness that a new school would bring, the city would refuse to accept their secondary students in its new school. The surrounding districts, each with its own board of education, protested, saying that such a move amounted to forced consolidation with Grand Ledge and would eliminate them as autonomous units. Their protest was carried to the state supreme court which decided that indeed Grand Ledge could accept or refuse whom it wished, in effect forcing the smaller districts to consolidate into a greater Grand Ledge school district.

That 1958 decision triggered many similar demands by K-12 districts, which, like Grand Ledge, had long taken in secondary students from small primary districts, but faced with the need for a new facility, wanted some help with the debt, and now had the court's approval for their move. With legal precedents in place, economic motives pressing and the weight of the respectable Conant report for support, the

consolidation, school-enlargement move continued unabated for the next 20 years. By 1960, the number of districts had dropped to 2216, by 1967 it was down to 745 and at present there are 526 K-12 districts and an additional 46 primary districts in the state. The push for efficiency from 1910 to after World War II and the move for consolidation, joined each other perfectly. Bigger and more specialized schools were considered more efficient. If one were to ask, why that is the case, or why it is believed to be the case, the response would be phrased in terms of the rational bureaucratic model. They promote increased specialization and differentiation, increased order, presumably a decreased need for resources, (this has never been tested), and an increased set of options for students. Therefore, to our list of characteristics including free, public, compulsory, popularized and specialized, subject to the dictum of efficiency, we may add large and consolidated. The latter was added for both economic and idealogical reasons. But in a society of large specialized organizations, the K-12 one room school house just did not fit at all. That we build large, diversified, specialized schools reflects our thinking about organizations in general. We would point out that the increase in size reinforced both the primary characteristic that schools are specialized, and the secondary characteristic, that in a differentiated system, there is no way other than personalized values, to judge as to the worthiness of the offerings. When we decided to teach a whole range of courses under one roof, in a popularized school, the educators no longer had to judge between a better or worse set of offerings.

There was another political decision at this time which affected the school's need to appeal to a broader audience. In 1957 in Michigan,

state school aid began to be distributed on the basis of students actually in attendance at school, not simply living in the attendance area. Schools then had to find ways to attract and keep students who formerly may have dropped out. The result was further specialization and further differentiation. This gave a new meaning to the term compulsory. Any individual subject which could attract the interest of adolescents, be it "girl talk," auto maintenance or Shakespeare is given equal weight in the curriculum. The Conant report made a reference to a related point when it decried the fact that students were not given time to both study and participate in activities. He noted that plays and musical and athletic events were conducted during school hours and on evenings prior to school, which to him indicated a poor attitude toward the importance of academic achievement. But that part of the report was ignored. What was recalled was what supported the popular and economically feasible thrust toward consolidation. The consolidation itself, creating larger, popular-based and more specialized organizations, further weakened the ability of educators to say that certain activities and classes were more worthy than others.

The question of what should and should not be taught has more often taken place outside the schools. A good example of this is in our own state where the thrust for more attention and care in school to children with "special" needs was begun by a lobbying group, the Parents of Mentally Retarded Children. They went to the legislature via the courts, on the way coopted the Michigan Department of Education (which was then and is still anxious to enlarge its purview), and came up with the special education laws. Among other things, these laws demand mainstreaming, increases in school specialities and accompanying specialists, and individual sessions for each special student with the

administrator, specialist teacher, guidance counselor and parent, meeting together to make curricular decisions. All of these have resulted in increased specialization, bureaucratization, and reliance on procedures, rules and regulations. But educators were not part of the planning of it. The next years brought no fundamental changes in the system we have outlined, but there were many innovations in the sixties.

> The following innovations attracted the most funding from foundations and the U.S. Office of Education during this decade of innovations:
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | team teaching | independent study |
> | modular scheduling | learning centers |
> | nongraded schools | open plan schools |
> | programmed learning | language laboratories |
> | individualized instruction | behavioral objectives |
> | computer assisted instruction | differentiated staffing |
>
> The Ford Foundation spent 30,000,000 dollars on these and other innovations in the 60's but concluded at the end of it, that the money had been spent without any significant results.

"Money alone seemed not to be decisive in innovative improvement. Most innovations were abandoned after the departure of the charismatic promoter or with the reduction of external funding."[52] In the list above, four of the innovations, team teaching, modular scheduling, non-graded schools and open plan schools might be said to aim toward breaking down the specialization and compartmentalization of the schools, and encouraging staff and students to do more interacting across classes, grades and statuses. Their aim can roughly be said to be the "increase of community." The remainder, computer-assisted instruction, individualized instruction, programmed learning, independent study and language laboratories might be said to extend the specialization and differentiation of the school. In fact one could conclude that the end of those innovations was a completely individualized system with each child having his particular

set of skills and needs met by a differentiated and compartmentalized system. Both of these separate and different approaches could be said to emanate from a child-centered approach to teaching, with the child being the important unit, being encouraged to expand his social and human skills by associating more freely with others while having his individual needs more closely attended to. This has been the major ideological assumption behind almost every one of the reforms mentioned, including some that were not on that list; notably the thrust toward the nine-week mini-classes that took over so many high school curricula. The assumptions are delineated thusly. The schools, as large and bureaucratic organizations, have as their priority, specialization, order, routine, discipline, and uniformity. The individual students are not only unique; that uniqueness should be made the basis of his education the school has to explore each student's needs and interests and then construct the curriculum so that each may find his or her own tailored education. The problem is not seen as size or specialization (although the accompanying emphasis on order and discipline is blamed), but an insufficient or inaccurately placed specialization. Whether one advocates a more particularly programmed and objective-based approach, both result in increased emphasis on the individual as opposed to the community. Operationally, they both stem from our pluralistic and egalitarian values and hence, even while phrased differently both elicit the same kind of organizational response. This has certainly been the argument used by those who wish schools were more responsive to minorities.

It has been suggested by some, termed "the romanticists," i.e. Kohl, Kozol, and Holt, that size and specialization themselves are the problem, and the alternative school movement comes from that opinion. But

operationally, when we placed the alternative schools in the bureaucracy, we further bureaucratized that bureaucracy and hence never addressed the real problem. In defense it should be pointed out that, by and large, Americans are probably content with their schools and unwilling to see its basic tenets undermined.

In addressing the changes in public secondary schools in the last 20 years since the Conant report, we have to also consider the desegregation decision which literally threw many urban schools into turmoil, and other legal decisions, such as the Gault case, which outlawed discretionary treatment of young people in juvenile court and stipulated that juveniles must be tried by the same rules of evidence as adults. The spread of children's rights and the awareness of children's rights, by the children themselves, has as Grant points out been one of the great untold curriculum success stories of the last decade.[53] Grant's thesis is that these initiatives on behalf of children's rights dramatically changes the "psychological reality in which adults interact with them." He cites cases where school staff members demur from giving guidance to adolescents for fear of trying to "impose an admittedly arbitrary set of personal values on another," and respecting the other's right to do as he so chooses, ignoring the fact that that "other" is a child. Certainly this move has lead to a considerable advance in bureaucratization in terms of the need for increased procedures in dealing with adolescents.

In our own state of Michigan, the Michigan Department of Education took as one of its chief activities, the spreading of awareness of students' rights to students themselves. Also in Michigan each school is obligated to have a policy outlining due process for students. A current bill before the state legislature, if passed, will mandate that

separate hearings be held for each student who is suspended from school for even one day for any reason, as opposed to the present system under which hearings occur only if the suspension is longer. While the extension of the adversarial-legal relationships into the school has changed the power relationships, we would point out that it has only increased and extended the basic assumptions about public secondary education that were in place 50 years ago.

The changes have come from the public (or some segment of the public), identifying some particular need or set of needs, or some individuals or set of individuals who were being treated inequitably by the public schools and have agitated for the addition of some set of courses, some curricular units, some added procedures or checks and balances to meet that need. Since educators had long ago given up on the task of judging which was a better education or even what comprised an education, they had no right or inclination to judge the worthiness of the proposed addition and simply stood outside the political pushing and pulling. Ultimately, if it was decided that such an innovation should be carried into the schools, they then devised some location in the building, created some place in the schedule and found someone on the staff to teach it, letting the students define whether they wanted to take it.

The result was a larger and more complex bureaucracy, which to many seems in itself to be the problem. Reflecting on the differences between the youth of former times and the youth of today, the President's Panel on Youth reported:

> The young are now different from their counterparts of the past in that they are more shaped by a self-conscious subculture formed around the adolescent stage of life. The instructional settings

> for them by society are also becoming fundamentally different. What is new in the present era as contrasted to pre-1945 America is a long self-conscious stage of adolescence and the formal envelopment of that stage within large and complex organizations that operate in a mesh of bureaucratic and professional controls.

While to each problem heretofore, the solution was phrased in terms of an increase in bureaucratization and specialization, it was now the case that the solution was seen as the problem. When that occurs, what then is the solution? For the President's Panel, the answer was to begin to de-institutionalize the schools. Among other things this commission suggested moving the students out of the school environment earlier, more frequently, in order to gather the real-life experiences to be had there. Basing their assumption that "diversity and plurality of paths to adulthood are important for the youth of any society,"[55] report suggests breaking the monopoly that schools have on youth's time, and creating alternative environments for moving to adulthood. Operationally they suggest using older students to instruct younger students, opening the schools to make greater use of community resources and community people who would take some responsibility for instruction, bringing young people into work situations earlier by simply moving into job-like environments, using community based organizations to give early experience in taking leadership and responsibility, and giving them increased responsibility for public service through outside agencies. If the foregoing sounds something like career education, it is certainly from the same perspective. The Kettering-backed "National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education" similarly made suggestions in its 1973 report:

> Recommendation No. 8: Expanding Career Opportunities
>
> Secondary schools must realign their curricula to provide students with a range of experience and activities broad

> enough to permit them to take full advantage of career opportunities in their communities. To meet this objective, basic components of the school program will have to be offered in the late afternoon or in the evening for some students.
>
> Recommendation No. 9: Career Education
>
> Career education advisory councils including representatives of labor, business, community, students, and former students should be established to assist in planning and implementing career education programs in comprehensive high schools.
>
> Career awareness programs should be initiated as an integral part of the curriculum to assure an appreciation of the dignity of work.
>
> Opportunities for exploration in a variety of career clusters should be available to students in grades 8 through 10.[56]

The Kettering Report echoed the President's Panel Report in criticizing the schools for monopolizing the students' time and suggested a more open environment with easier access from school to community and back. They advocated calling on local resources from both school and community to solve what they defined as problems. Their findings and suggestions centered on the implementation of career education as a means of making some synthesis of school and community, academic studies and work. They also hoped that the inclusion of career in the curriculum would not only break up the isolation of the school, but would better prepare students for work.

Their findings were repeated to a considerable degree by the 1978 Carnegie Council on Higher Education, which too looked upon the comprehensive high school (which the Carnegie Foundation advocated in the 1959 Conant report), as the problem rather than the solution. "We must find ways to break up the big monolithic high school with its deadly routine"[57] is the way they put it, forgetting their advocacy of that big monolith 20 years earlier. That advocacy is just what helped put several hundred adolescents under the same roof for their entire school day and hence directly created the need

for order and routine that they decry. In their summary of recommended changes for secondary schools, they suggest:

> Change the basic structure of high schools by making them smaller or by creating diversity within them or both; by creating full-time specialty schools, particularly for the grades 11 and 12; by creating part-time specialty schools--one or two days a week per student on a rotating basis--by providing one or two days a week for education-related work and/or service. We must find ways to break up the big, monolithic high school and its deadly weekly routine.
>
> Create work and service opportunities for students through the facilities of the high schools, making performance part of the student record. We also favor a renewed emphasis on student out-of-class activities.
>
> Stop the tracking of students; all programs should be individualized programs.
>
> Put applied skill training in private shops (with the exception of clerical skills and home economics), when not moved to the postsecondary level. The basic vocational (and academic) skills for the high school to concentrate on are the skills of literacy and numeracy--and good work habits.
>
> Finance needy students through work-study programs and more effective efforts to place them in jobs.
>
> Create job preparation and placement centers in the high schools that will follow students for their first two years after graduation or other termination.
>
> Improve the capacity of secondary schools to teach basic skills by allocating more federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to secondary schools. We strongly support the "Push for Excellence" program led by Reverend Jesse Jackson.
>
> Encourage earlier entry from high school into college and more programs combining the last year or two of high school with college.
>
> Experiment with vouchers and greater freedom of choice, particularly among public schools. Bureaucratic controls have not assured quality; competition to survive may.[57]

Break up the monolith, individualize, further compartmentalize, concentrate on the less advantaged students, create career education programs which will facilitate the transition from youth to adulthood, etc. The latest are but a list of the same criticisms that the prior two reports contained.

According to public school people there are two problems with these criticisms. First, is the perspective toward the school routine, as the critics call it, or the "schedule", as the public school people call it. For the former, it is both monolithic and deadly; for the latter faced with the problem of having several hundred adolescents under the same roof, it is what makes sense of the diverse educational experiences offered to all those people every day. For them the problem is not the routine, the problem is the need for orderly and discernible processes. The solution is the routine. To the critics who interestingly enough are from foundations, state agencies, universities, private and public research groups and community action societies, but not public schools, the problem is not only routine but also the closed-ness and isolation of the institution. For the school people closed-ness and isolation are (1) solutions to the problem of order and predictability, and (2) an answer to community people who do not want their adolescents on the street during the day time. To the residents of Laingsburg, Michigan, the idea that a few garages, sundry stores and small businesses could absorb the energy of 330 adolescents is simply absurd. To the residents of Okemos, a bedroom suburb with no downtown, no stores outside a shopping mall and no industry, the idea is equally absurd. Perhaps it would work in Lansing with its stores, factories and government offices, if there were not 6,000 adolescents, to contend with. To speak facilely of achieving open, easy, access from school to community is to ignore a reality that school people know. The parents, store owners, police and residents do not want adolescents running around the streets during the day, nor do they want custody of them in the pursuit of educational goals; They expect that of the school.

Summary

Our intent in the preceding pages has been to discuss the environment of secondary schools. Our study takes as a premise the sociological assumption that within an environment is a set of givens, a psychological background in which certain things are taken for granted and make sense, while others, intelligent enough by themselves, do not. We want to understand and itemize the psychological environment of secondary schools and for that reason are attempting to lay out those givens.

As we see it, secondary schools have been constructed according to certain levels of priorities. Among those on the first level have been the natural need to grow and expand with the country and the belief in cultural pluralism. Operationalized in the school, these priorities resulted in large comprehensive schools with many diverse and specialized offerings. There are secondary priorities such as the press for economic efficiency in a country that prides itself on its business mentality, and pressures from groups who want their particular constituencies to be better served. Among the requests made by the second group are demands that schools teach the evils of drugs and alcohol, humane treatment for birds and animals, sex hygiene, driver education, consumer economics and career education, all of which the schools of this state are required to teach and all of which represent responses to particular interest groups. These secondary pressures, too, result in a more specialized, diversified and compartmentalized curriculum.

There is then the third level of pressures which are brought to bear by educators and those who think of themselves as students of education. The collectivization of teachers, special education, and the student rights movement, which give individuals in the organization a heightened sense of their own importance relative to the organization, both come from these groups. These elements further compartmentalize and diversify the system.

Also in this group are those who have looked at the increasing size and specialization of schools and are upset by the reports that show school having little effect on achievement and little variation in instructional methods. They conclude that the schools should reverse the trend toward increased size and compartmentalization by placing many of its processes into the community where it is assumed they can be more effectively handled. So far these latter suggestions have not been followed. In our opinion they are somewhat frivolous and ill considered, for they fail to take the basic fact of surveillance into consideration.

But admittedly the schools do have a problem and perhaps it can be explained in organizational terms.

> ...the central problem for complex organizations is one of coping with uncertainty. As a point of departure, we suggest that organizations cope with uncertainty by creating certain parts specifically to deal with it, specializing other parts in operating under conditions of uncertainty or near certainty. In this case, articulation of these specialized parts becomes significant.[58]

Not only does the press for cultural pluralism and diversity get followed by the schools, that following serves the purposes of the school and helps the organization deal with the uncertainties of a pluralistic population. The problem is that in schools, unlike many organizations which have a hard technology, the specialization is not accompanied by a corresponding increase in standardization and supervision.

"When organizations employ standardization which cuts across multiple groupings they also develop liaison positions linking the several groups and the rule making agency."[59] But schools have not done that. The liaison positions have not been created for a number of reasons, economic efficiency among them, but mostly because the school people themselves, as imbued with the value of cultural pluralism as anyone else, really do not have any idea what they want to coordinate things into.

School people had long ago given up the idea that an educator knows better what comprised an education. This deprives them of any internal ethos which would help them defend themselves against the charge of "unresponsiveness." In effect the lack of coordination can be said to result from having no consistent idea what it was they wanted to teach. Not only did they not hire the liaison people for economic reason, but also there is simply no great value placed on liaison. There is a side effect. It seems to us that the heavy reliance the school places on the schedule and the accompanying routinization is designed partly to make up for the lack of coordination of learning activities. If we cannot coordinate our teaching, at least we can give some basic appearances of order and uniformity. This opens the schools to a brand new charge, that they are monolithic and sterile and despite decades of specialization and diversification are still unresponsive to the basic needs of individual students. One begins to think that no matter what the schools do that accusation will always be there.

The latest wave of criticism is that it is time to break up the monolithic, uniform, and sterile structure because it failed to diversify sufficiently to satisfy all the possible individuals' needs. Whether this latest suggestion will result in any positive action is questionable. The ability of public schools to resist outside influence, particularly the outside influence of "experts" from foundations, government, and universities, is considerable. So for the present, we have secondary schools that contain and will probably continue to contain just those characteristics that the critics disparage: diversification, isolation of parts, lack of coordination, compartmentalization and a heavy reliance on order and discipline.

CHAPTER II

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain the network of relations within the professional staffs of two secondary schools. Two schools were selected, cooperation and permission were obtained from official channels, and field methods were used. The study ran from January 1979 to March 1980.

Description

In this chapter, we will describe networks that existed in the two subject schools. For purposes of clarity, we will describe the action of both schools at the same time, rather than devoting a long space to one, and a second long space to the other. In our opinion, this will lead to greater plausibility, which after all is the major test of validity in a field study.

The study took place in two separate high schools in two separate cities in Southeastern Michigan. One school was in an urban area of an industrial city of 85,000 on the northwestern fringe of Detroit. Most of its wage-earning citizens are employed either in one of the large General Motors plants, such as Truck and Coach, Pontiac Motors, or Fisher Body, or in one of the numerous automobile-related tool and die shops. In full employment years, 45,000 industrial and 25,000 clerical, service and government workers are employed within the city limits. During its fast-growing years, this city drew large numbers of European immigrants into its environs, and since World War II large numbers of American southerners have come north to work in its factories. With this influx of primarily black southern laborers, the residential areas, which were always divided according to ethnic background, became divided racially. The black pop-

ulation lived predominantly on the south side or river area, popularly known as the "black bottom." The defacto segregation in housing patterns led to a corresponding de facto segregation of students into white and black schools. In 1870 of the twenty elementary schools, only three were integrated; of the six junior high schools, two were all white, two were black and two were integrated. At the senior high level, there was integration, particularly in our subject school. This school segregation was given tacit approval by the board of education, and so given the temper of the times, it was inevitable that it would be challenged.

On February 17, 1970, as a result of a suit filed by the NAACP cooperating attorneys, a federal judge found that the nine new schools built between 1955 and 1963 served to reinforce segregation. That judge then ordered the district to submit a plan for complete desegregation of the schools. In response, the school board and administrators developed a plan to desegregate the elementary and junior high schools by busing. The plan was to be implemented in September, 1971, and it was met with heavy and hostile opposition. In the summer of 1971, a National Action Group (NAG) attracted thousands to its rallies to protest busing. The group was successful in its efforts to close down Fisher Body for one day. When the schools were to open in September, blockades were set up around the buses, women chained themselves to the fence surrounding the bus depot, and ten of the buses were actually bombed by a group later identified as the Ku Klux Klan. After the schools opened, the protests continued with a school boycott, but, after a few weeks, the students returned and school continued, integrated but moderately peacefully. But the bitterness lingered. In 1971 the racial balance of the schools was 56% white; in 1980 the percentage is 47% white. Hundreds of white families have simply

taken their children and left the school district. As of May of 1980, the last five school millages have gone down to defeat, with the white enclaves of the city voting overwhelmingly to deny operating funds to the school, and the schools facing the possibility of closing their doors even before the end of the year, because there is no money. The insiders in the system are unanimous in their opinion that it is not simply inflation or unemployment, both problems in an auto town, but the bitterness left by the legacy of integration.

The school itself is a very modern structure situated on the main east-west thoroughfare through the city. It is immediately surrounded by a residential area containing large and opulent homes only a few blocks from the center of the city. Both the homes and downtown area have seen better days. Many of the homes are presently being used as half-way houses for formerly imprisoned drug addicts or mental incompetents, with many of the downtown stores closed and boarded up. The chief feature of the downtown area is the traffic pattern, with a east-west highway crossing a major north-south highway. The factories have stayed and the worst of the derelict buildings have been cleared away by urban renewal, but what is left are the highways and traffic, the parking lots, shuttered stores and government buildings. There are few shopping areas left in the downtown section, fewer pedestrians and no signs of affluence. It remains as a crossroads for the people who live in one direction to go in another, a highway crossing with some government projects to keep some activity there.

The school itself is three blocks from the downtown area. It is a large and very modern expensive structure with five levels, two above ground, two below. On the first floors are the locker and cafeteria sections, the library and offices in the center, and long corridors surrounding this with classrooms off the corridors. Toward the center of the

building on the second floor there are the same long corridors going around the perimeter of the building and down the center with the classroom off the corridor. On the below ground levels are also classrooms, but also shops for woods, metals, home economics, gymnasiums and swimming pool, paddle ball courts and weight rooms.

The building was constructed in 1960 to house up to 3,000 students, something less than the number in the older school at that time, but the population decline has dropped the present number to 2,000. Seventy percent of these two thousand black and white students are bussed in from the area every day, while the remainder walk or drive their cars which they park behind the school.

The Utica School district is in the northern part of the Detroit Metropolitan area located eleven miles east of Pontiac. The district is heavily populated with 29,000 students in its schools, making it the third largest school district in the state. Utica High is the oldest of four high schools in the system, and with its 1500 students, it is also the smallest. Until the early 1950's, the district has been a small town surrounded by mushroom, onion and dairy farms, but in the ensuing twenty-five years, the whole area was enmeshed in superhighways and overrun by subdivisions, large factories and shopping centers. The district with its 29,000 students still carries the name of the small town, and, although there are still some of the family farms intact, there is little left that resembles that small town. Almost all of the district's residents are white and their economic status is varied.

The school is a comprehensive secondary school offering 168 separate courses divided into academic, arts and vocational areas. It is located in a single building constructed in 1957, surrounded on three sides by parking lots, with a baseball diamond and football field located on the

grounds but some distance from the building. In organizational structure, it is typical of comprehensive secondary schools. The seven hour and fifteen minute day is divided into eight fifty-minute periods. The 1528 students move about from class to class, and each of the sixty-eight teachers teaches five of those classes each day. The arrangement of the halls and rooms supports that structure. Most of the school, with the exception of the gymnasium, music area and cafeteria, is composed of long corridors with 40' by 40' classroom on either side. In addition to the teachers, the school is staffed by three administrators, three guidance counselors, attendance and hall personnel, several secretaries and cafeteria and custodial workers.

Organization and Administration

Our report will describe and explain the networks among the professional staffs of two secondary schools, and will assess and analyze the effects of those networks on the schools. First we want to explain the organization and administration of the structure in which the networking took place. Throughout the description we will continue to describe and analyze both schools in the same section. They are sufficeintly diverse, for Pontiac is an urban school of 2100 students, 50 percent black and 50 percent white, while Utica is a suburban school with 1500 students, all white. One will know which is being referred to at any time. The points we wish to make and the conclusions we will draw will be better understood from a perspective involving the schools together.

Both are comprehensive high schools founded on the principle that the school should serve diversified offerings to a diversified student body. Accordingly, the staff of sixty-eight teachers in Utica and 101 teachers in Pontiac were divided into academic specialties. Each teacher specialist,

by contract, spent five periods each day instructing students in the specialty; i.e., the English teacher teaching writing, reading and analysis; the metals teacher teaching welding, stress and design; the PE teacher, fundamentals of movement. In Utica, in addition to the five instruction periods, each was to do supervisory duty in the corridor, lavatory, cafeteria or study hall for one period and had one preparation period and one lunch period. Some of the Utica teachers, to the dismay of the union-minded, elected to take a sixth class rather than the duty, and many more were not even assigned duty, there being more teachers than duty stations.

In Pontiac, the day was only five periods long and at 12:50 the students all went home, there being no lunch, activity or cafeteria period. This five by five schedule had been adopted in the sixties by many urban schools as a response to real and potential racial violence. Trouble occurred where the students were allowed to come together outside class, so those times were simply eliminated from the day. At 1:00 p.m. the only students left are the varsity athletes, a few seeking extra help or a few "walkers" waiting in the lobby for a friend, but the rest are on their way home. For the teacher in Pontiac the time from 12:50 to 2:45 is designated for lunch and preparation.

In both schools, the list of departments was almost identical; English, physical education, science, fine arts, business, special education, music and foreign language. These departments served a number of organizational purposes. First they gave some sense of curricular order to the physical structure since in both buildings the math teachers were assigned to one general area in a wing or a hallway, the English teachers to another, science to another and so on. In addition to the subject classrooms in those areas, there was a departmental office that served all the members

of his unit. But in Pontiac with every teacher busy every period, the offices were seldom used except for storage or a quick break between classes.

In either school one was expected to join in with others in the department to decide what classes to offer, who should take which of them and what books should be ordered. As such, the departments served to facilitate some administrative functions of the school. Because of their additional responsibilities, the department chairpersons in both schools, while paid on the teacher schedule, were also given an additional stipend of $500.00. The chairpersons in Utica taught four instead of five classes and were exempted from supervisory duty; the department chairpersons in Pontiac were given their five hundred dollars, but none of the additional benefits. While the department was a quasi-administrative unit in terms of scheduling, allocation of supplies and dissemination of materials, the chairperson had no supervisory authority relative to teachers, nor any more than a teacher relative to students. For that reason, while one enjoyed the benefits and the modest prestige, it was a limited position, and held only at the pleasure of the principal.

The next step in the administrative structure was that of associate principal as the two were called in Utica, or grade principals as the three were called in Pontiac. Because of the centrality of these people in the structure and their key position relative to teachers, we should explain their role. In both schools, their duties were "attendance and discipline," although in Pontiac, which had more trouble, these were done to the exclusion of everything else. In Pontiac one was assigned to the ninth, one to the tenth, and one to the eleventh and twelfth grade. In Utica one was assigned to the ninth and tenth and one to the eleventh and twelfth grades.

In both schools the assistants' offices consisted of large anterooms with one personal secretary and one or two more attendance secretaries. These rooms were centers of endless coming and going of teachers coming in in the morning and out at night, of people wanting to purchase tickets in Pontiac or to purchase a snack between class, of teachers reporting an incident with a student, of people such as the attendance officers or hall guards coming in to talk, drink coffee, exchange information or pleasantries or get something. Each office in either school also served as a center for a few teachers who liked and related to that particular administrator. These offices were the busiest places in either school, serving as centers of information, authority, action, discipline and socializing.

The main purpose of these offices was to serve the endless stream of students sent in to get a late admit slip, or an early release slip, a parking permit, a work permit or a physical check permit, but most were there because they had been involved in some sort of disagreement with a teacher and were "sent to the office" or "called to the office." In Pontiac there was rarely a time when there were not at least three or four of these students in each office for tardiness, fighting, insolence, failure to come to or leave class as requested, failure to complete assignments, or whatever. There were endless reasons why students were there but most of them involved a dispute. When they were there they would explain the problem to the administrator who would then, depending on the nature of the offense, send the student back to class with a note, arrange a meeting between the teacher and the student, keep the student until the end of the period, suspend him or her for a day or if the matter were serious, move into formal processes.

Related to the latter choices was the process of trying to contact parents, some of whom had no phone, some of whom were ignorant of school

policies and their child's behavior and many of whom were unavailable during the day because they worked on the line at one of the auto plants. Of course, the majority of the parents, when reached, were quite supportive of the school, but our point is that the series of students involved in this discipline and attendance issue, with the sometimes complex procedures that attended the policy, literally took up the entire day of the three house principals in Pontiac, and probably half the day of the two associates in Utica. It took patience to deal with these issues.

> "I didn't do nothing," as he handed the principal the teacher's slip.
> "Well it says here you failed to hand in your work for five days in a row."
> "That old teacher just didn't like me, all I do is walk in and she starts yellin'."
> "Well did you do your homework?"
> "It wasn't my fault, my brother took my books...."

This one ended when the principal took out the contract that the student had agreed to abide by, and told the student that if he did not do his homework he would fail his class, and "in two months you'll be sixteen and then we don't have to keep you here anymore.". The student agreed, in principle at least, and waited until the period ended. An interesting point about this interminable round of events is that there is rarely any emotion displayed by either party. For the principals, discipline was an issue, rarely a problem. The skipping or tardiness or disrespect was not the problem. The "problem" is the emotion that attends the event. Discipline "problems" occur in front of the whole class where a teacher's authority and expertise are threatened and the student is feeling exposed in the presence of his friends. It is there that tempers flare, accusations and recriminations are made and "problems" occur.

By the time it gets to the principal's office which is a walk down a hall or a flight of stairs, the spectators are gone and the principal is neither personally responsible nor threatened. By that time, it is a

procedure and a process, the main feature of which is its tiresomeness and repetitiveness. Neither the student, who probably wants to stay in school, nor the principal, with whom the student may have a decent, even personal relationship, wants the matter to get any worse, and so when the principal makes some judgement as to which of his procedures he will evoke, the parent called or the child suspended or reprimanded, or a conference held, then the whole thing just drifts into the record. The school has policies, each principal has her or his own way of enforcing those policies, and the events simply roll over one another. Even the more difficult occurrences become routine, such as a fight between two students, one black and one white, who by the time they were in the principal's offices were still mouthing threats...

> "Hey, this dude thinks he's tough, and he wanted to start something...."
> "You asked for it, you were picking on that little kid last week."
> "That was none of your business and you didn't start nothing then."
> "Well, I'll start something now...."
> "Well, go ahead..."

And so one, but neither moved from the chair he was in. The fight was over and both agreed that they would go home, and accepted the automatic suspension for fighting, and the fact that their parents would have to come to get them reinstated. While attendance and discipline and major concerns in any school, our biracial urban school with a reputation for being a tough place had a systematic and procedural way to deal with the problem and, in fact, the process worked.

It did not always work to the satisfaction of the teachers. Many were dissatisfied with this or that principal because as they put it, he failed to follow up on a "referral", or, when they sent a student to the office, nothing happened to him. What they meant was that the procedures

that were evoked were not likely to effect any change. For the teachers, even more than the student, the event was likely to have risen to an emotional level with their authority threatened, the importance of their subject questioned and their personal dignity affronted. When they did send a student out they were usually upset, wanted some action and judged the competence of the administrator on the basis of whether he backed them up by "doing something about it."

It irritated them that a principal in Pontiac suspended students pending a hearing with the parents, but if the parents called and talked to him within the very hour, he readmitted the student. That another would simply put the offending student in another class, or send the student back with no explanation to the teacher, or would not even contact the teacher, also irritated them. They wanted "follow up," parent conferences, suspensions, expulsions; sometimes they wanted the student out of the class for the semester, that is, something to get the student to recognize their position and value their mission. No teacher felt he or she threw too many students out of class. They wanted each incident treated as important. What they did not want was to have a conference with the student's side of the event given equal weight with theirs. The administratiors supported the teachers as much as they felt they could in these events, but they tried to keep their emotional distance. And too, the administrators, particularly in Pontiac where many more incidents occurred, were under pressure from the central office to avoid expulsions and reduce suspensions. One administrator was pointedly reminded by an assistant superintendent when he went for his forty-first expulsion, that he "already had forty for this year." Neither school could afford to throw out many students. They needed the state aid which was allocated on a per-pupil basis. In

Pontiac, they needed the good will of the taxpayers, and were wary of the charge of racism against black students. The central office administrators not only questioned the building administrators closely about suspensions and expulsions, but when they served as hearing officers in an explusion case, often refused to expel. As one teacher said of the present superintendent when he served as a hearing office, "He would say, 'Now John, you know you assaulted that teacher. You have no excuse. Now, when you come back to school on Monday morning'....." And an assistant principal admitted that he was prevented from enforcing the rules by the central office, the parents and the principal, whom he said was under pressure from the first two.

We don't wish to exaggerate the number or seriousness of disciplinary issues in the school. In both places there was a mature staff capable of handling their classes in acceptable ways, but still there was an endless stream of discipline issues coming into each assistant principal's office all the time. Those principals had their procedures and policies, but each tried to keep his or her emotional distance from these issues and treating them as issues to be processed, not problems about which to become upset. Their repertoire was quite limited, including only suspension, reprimands, an appeal to one's sense of justice or desire to graduate, a reminder of the need for patience or an appeal to a personal trust.

When administrators complained about teachers, it was about those who sent them more than a few students and who seemed to think they had more power or access to power than they really had. But their power was really limited to those students who saw the value of attendance at school:

> One girl came in with her father and I told her that if she skipped again I was going to have to suspend her and she just sat there looking down and he (the father) looked at her and said, 'You're just going to have to come to

> school.' And she just sat there and I said, 'Betty, look me in the eye when I'm talking to you so I get some understanding that you hear me.' And she looked up, but she had an expression that told me she was going out that door as soon as she could. Now she's gone.

Also they disparaged teachers who did not understand that since education was generally viewed as a property right and not a privilege, then to attempt to deprive a student of it, meant that the offense had to be serious, and second that a lengthy process had to be invoked. They couldn't just "throw someone out of school" as some teachers wanted. They could not just throw out a boy, of whom it was known by the police officers, that he had, when an altercation broke out in the hall, hit the principal from behind with a heavy book and had knocked him out. "We know he did it but we can't prove it..." Nor some of whom it was known by the administrator and the police that they were selling hard drugs in the corridors, but..."We can't catch him, but (laughter) that's all right, he's destined for a short life." Nor of another of whom it was known that he had killed two men. "We know he did it but, but we can't prove it." That was in Pontiac which, as an urban school, has a greater share of violence; yet in Utica some boys had vandalized a teacher's car and had attempted to intimidate an administrator through threats to her family, but no expulsion occurred there either. The boys simply said they "would not do it again."

In both schools, this business took a great deal of time and energy. In Pontiac there were three full time grade principals, each having one or two secretaries and several student aides. There were two full time plain clothes policemen and six adult hall monitors stationed near the entrances and lavatories. If we added up the cost of that surveillance, it would come to something in excess of $300,000 per year, just in salaries and benefits. In Utica there were two full time associate principals who

probably spent half their time in that endeavor, each having one full time secretary. In addition there was one truant officer and seven attendance personnel. Their total salaries probably amounted well over $150,000. These people were busy with that endeavor all the time. We would add that the head principal in either school often spent his time, too, in attending to these matters. In Pontiac the decision is presently pending whether one assistant principal currently assigned to curriculum might better be spending his time supervising a grade for purposes of attendance and discipline. There was nowhere near the same amount of money and energy expended in the creation or coordination of curriculum.

Our second point is that to the degree that either of these schools had something called a philosophy, then the main tenet was that the school was designed to be responsive to individual students. In fact, in the general goals of the school district of the city of Pontiac, it states "If children fail to develop and grow as we reasonable expect they should, the shortcomings or errors should be focused upon the structure of the system and community, not upon the children. The school district must recognize and support the notion that the educational system is operated by adults with power, available resources and control and therefore children do not fail to learn, the schools and other community components fail to teach." In Utica, the philosophy, although less specific, was still the foundation of the structure. The school was designed to serve the student and give him or her as many opportunities as possible to attain an education. At least until it became dangerous to other students as it sometimes did, or when the student rejected every opportunity, the administrators tried to keep the students in school.

There is a third implication to this. Our argument in the beginning

is that schools are locally popularized, that is they are supposed to serve the people in the community and are also subject to the demands of cost efficiency. The first of these forces requires that the administrators give the students every possible chance for an education. So they value most highly those teachers who "get along with kids," and do not send them to the office for actions which could lead to suspension.

Secondly, the press for efficiency means that while we spend what we have to spend on administrative discipline to keep students in school, there are not many resources available for program development or coordination. That the administrators spend their time on attendance and discipline, not curriculum, has an effect similar to the first; that is, the teacher is left to his own resources as to how to "get along with kids:" and how to conduct himself in the classroom with regard to his subject matter. It is this latter point that we wish to pursue in our description of teachers and their networks.

Summary

Out intent in the preceeding section was to outline the organizational structure of the school from teacher to department to associate or grade principal to principal. While we stressed the handling of discipline and attendance, our intent was not to present either as a "problem" school. In fact both buildings ran quite smoothly. Fights and assaults were very rare in Utica and not that common in Pontiac, the halls and classes were generally orderly and the demeaner of students was acceptable. But in both schools, many resources had been put into the smooth running of the school, and smooth running meant having little trouble between teacher and student, student and student. The net effect of this was that the administrators valued teachers who took care of their own student problems, who

liked and got along with students, and who did not place additional burdens on the administrators who already, even with mature and competent staffs, spent an enormous amount of time on these issues. This "liking and getting along with kids" was not only important for teachers but for the administrators who had to process the incidents. One likes kids and resorts to punishment only as a last resort. That is the basic value extant in the structure, and it has a number of implications, particularly for the contacts between and among teachers. The fact is that there is in either school no universalistic criteria for dealing with students beyond this general admonition that one "get along with them" and the way one "gets along with them" is not scrutinized.

The Teachers

There are 101 teachers at Pontiac Central high school, sixty eight at Utica and, as we explained, they are divided into departments. Each has his own set of classes and each is expected to work out some way to work with his students. A teacher's day in either school is not particularly long, from 7:30 to 2:30, but it is a full time. In Pontiac the teachers were older than in Utica simply because with the budget problems there no one with fewer than 13 years of experience was even working in Central High. The background of teachers in either building was similar, but more similar in Utica. In that area, dispite the fact that 25 years prior it had been a small village among large farms, and dispite the accompanying fact that almost everyone there had come from somewhere else, almost all teachers were from the metropolitan area of Detroit, and had attended the regional state colleges. Almost all had taken their teacher certification in undergraduate school and had been with the Utica schools for their entire career.

There were exceptions of course. One older teacher recounted how he had majored in liberal arts, but had gone into farming and after running into $20,000 dollars of debt to the bank was advised by that banker to go see the local school superintendent. He obtained a job teaching, paid the debt to the banker and stayed in schools for his career. The other noticeable point which we began to investiate but gave up when it did not seem to lead anywhere was that so many of the people in that building had come to the job from some contact in the school system. The principal came in from Detroit because some of his friends had moved to Utica, another teacher came from that same area of Detroit, some few were connected to the older farming families in the area, some had done their student teaching in the same school. A number attended Utica High themselves, some were married to teachers or administrators in other buildings, another was the son of an athletic director in another school, another the daughter of a teacher in another building and another the family friend of the athletic director. Few were from another part of the country, had attended non-state schools or spent any time as full-time graduate students. The district has never made any effort to recruit from other than those regional state schools or to recruit from a varied background. The sole black member of the staff was a black, female, associate principle who had taught in the system for seven years prior to attaining her administrative job. Those who were not connected internally in some way had come to their jobs because there was an opening. Each had applied around the metropolitan area and had chosen Utica because that was where the first job was. Some of these had been teaching in other systems, some were in parochial schools, some had taught for some time but had been denied tenure because of declining enrollments in other districts and had found that Utica was still hiring.

The whole hiring process was a bit haphazard. One was hired because he or she had graduated with a major in some speciality and was available for work in the district. No one recounted being recruited because of his or her record of accomplishments somewhere else, nor because he wanted to come to Utica as a place where some exciting things were happening of which he wanted to be a part. No one accounted for their position by dint of noteworthy scholarship or dedication or a winning record. No one reported herself or was reported by others to have brought in something special to the school. One might say that since most of them came immediately from undergraduate school, it would have been unrealistic to expect. On the other hand, no one reported that he was trying to build an outstanding record which could be converted into a better job. The sole exception to this was the teacher who handled the yearbook; she reported that she came to her present position based on success with other yearbooks.

There was some justification for the hiring patterns. The Utica district had had only two superintendents in the past 15 years, and both were quite successful in generating community support in the form of taxes for the schools. It seemed that when possible, they hired people who were related to or knew people in the community or district as a means of cementing the school and community ties. We were unable to test that, but it did help to explain the large number of people who had all those ties to others in the district. It does help to explain how one makes a decision as to whom to hire when there does not seem to be any ostensible external criteria. The school wanted a "woods teacher" or a social studies teacher or a gym teacher with a water safety certificate. The criteria for hiring were that general, and someone whom someone new was preferable to a complete stranger. In Pontiac, the staff was 30% black and many had

been recruited from Texas and Alabama during the 60's. That alone would diversify the faculty considerably more than in Utica, but, in addition, Pontiac had many who were from other parts of the country, who had had careers in educational administration or some other field such as business or the ministry, who were born in foreign countries or who had been professional athletes. It was stated that when Pontiac was hiring teachers in the 50's and 60's an attempt had been made to attract diverse people.

While Utica, more than Pontiac, had the goal of integrating the community and the school, in neither building were there many people who reported maintaining strong community ties. In Pontiac few of the teachers lived in the district, or sent their children to district schools. In fact, many of those who did live in the district sent their children to private schools. In Utica only one of the three administrators lived in the district, and most of the teachers lived in adjoining districts. Their only tie to the community came through their position. We will return to this point later when describing the networks among the staff.

So far we have described a setting and structure which embodied the basic patterns of comprehensive high schools, and an administrative pattern which was devoted to the all-important tasks of attendance and discipline. We added a departmental structure, which was not much more than a loose confederation that existed only to order and distribute supplies and assign classes, and a central office structure that was not only distant but busy with issues of a different nature, such as building, compliance with state laws, finance, hiring and firing. The sum of all this is that the teachers in either school are, after they are handed their scheduled assignments, quite free to develop the pattern of accommodation that suits them. Our point in the next fifty pages is to demonstrate the egocentric fields and the generalized networks that arise as a result

of this freedom.

For the professional staff in either building, school life revolved around the schedule. There are ten subject areas broken into academics, vocational and arts, and each teacher, by training and certification, is regarded as a specialist in one or perhaps two of them. Each is assigned by union contract to teach five classes on each of 180 school days in that area. One has his five classes of math, physical education, science, music, or art, etc.; one additional period in which he is expected to do a duty assignment in the corridor, study hall or cafeteria; one lunch period; and one preparation period. To the displeasure of the union-minded, some elect to take a sixth class rather than a duty period, but that is generally regarded as their right. Between periods, the schedule allows for five minutes passing time during which classes are to be ended, other classes prepared for, AV machines to be moved about, books to be put away or laid out, a smoke, lavatory break, or any of a number of things to be attended to. But most of this time, too, is taken up with student matters. Summed up, over three-quarters of the teachers' day, by schedule and contract, is spent in the company of students, attending to their instruction, answering their questions, or just being in their presence, with students, of course, always outnumbering the teachers by some large number to one.

In addition to classes, duty assignment or extra class, the teacher's preparation period might also often be spent in the company of students. It was an ethic among the staff at Utica to treat students with patience and courtesy. If two teachers were talking and a student approached one of them, the student was always attended to immediately. If a group of teachers were in the departmental office adjacent to their teaching area and a student wanted to see one, the student may or may not have been

admitted, but he was always attended to, and if he were admitted then what ever action was in progress stopped while he and the teacher were talking. If a group were gathered in the vice principal's office and a student showed up with a request, the interaction stopped while he was taken care of. Wherever teachers were in that school, whether working or resting or socializing, a student's request was always heard and attended to. Teachers were always at the disposal of students. It was a common element among the professional staff of the school, and while we observed disparate and diverse behaviors among the teachers, they all adhered to it. "We're here for the kids," was the way most put it, and being "here for kids," meant attending to them whenever and wherever one was in the school. Of course in Pontiac, this was less apparent, simply because one was always teaching in front of a class, instructing in some way or another, and when she was not, there were few students in the school. So we did not see the teachers in non-teaching situations when there were students around. But they too mouthed the same ethic, that "we're here for the kids", or "you have to get along with kids" or "you have to like kids". And indeed, the "kids" were given attention. This is not to say that all students were treated the same way. There were not, but teachers were obligated by the simple fact that they had to spend five periods a day or more every day in their presence to personally accomodate to that presence.

But the accommodations were quite different. By different, we mean that one could find a way to teach which fits his own style, opinions, predilections, inclinations or whatever, and justify it in terms of being "good for kids." Some stressed writing, some personal relations, some deportment; some assigned homework, some did not; some spoke to students in a teenage jargon, some held up higher standards of speech and deportment.

Some put normative compliance into their jobs and made them the centers of their lives, others gave little time and put their involvement into their families, second jobs or avocations. There was no standard way to behave relative to the curriculum or the students. Teachers emphasized what they wanted to emphasize. One who cared about philosophy, an ex-seminarian at Pontiac, created an elective course in philosophy and nurtured it to the point where he taught three classes of it every day for years. The philosophy that he taught was that of Aristotle and Plato because that was the philosophy that interested him. But it would have been acceptable for him to teach Locke, Berkeley and Hume. He found a way to do what he wanted to do. Another was a social studies teacher who tried to develop a course on geography, which was his major, but was not successful. Now, by his own admission he "gets a map into every social studies lesson he has." Another taught social studies and was interested in the stock market. He developed two economics classes, the focus of which became reading and studying stocks, purchasing stocks in a few Michigan companies, and when possible, attending the Board of Directors meetings. The stock profits were used for the trips while the teacher absorbed the losses himself by re-purchasing the stock from the students. An English teacher loved music, put on musical performances and worked as a show promoter for some local agencies. He created an elective called "Music as Expression" where he played Bach, the Beatles, street rock, the Beach Boys and all the music he liked in his classes, which were quite well-subscribed by both black and white students. The program consisted of listening, studying lyrics, and writing about and from those lyrics. He referred to his class as "relevant" and "interesting" and was very proud of having the "most popular elective class in this school." When he played Gill Scott Herron's

poetry:

> When the revolution comes
> Preacher pimps are going to split the scene
> with the communion wine stuck in their back pockets
> Faggets won't be so funny then
> And all the junkies will quit their nodding and wake up
> When the revolution comes...[60]

According to him the course "was what the kids related to and needed." He spoke of the relevance of the message for this biracial school. But when asked about that class, some English teachers literally spat out their distaste for "what he calls English."

There were some teachers who had been hired to teach business math. One either was or had become interested in computers, for he arranged a class in computer programming and begged or borrowed a keypunch and card sorters. Additionally, he sold candy between classes to earn money for some small computers, four of which he was able to purchase, one at a time, after two years. He also arranged with the central office to use its data processing equipment one afternoon a week and had his line into the large computer in the Intermediate District. In effect, he created his own curriculum in response to his own interests. That is the way a great part of the curriculum of either school had been created. The latter teacher was an interesting case because he used so many different lines of resources. He contacted outside agencies, used money that he raised himself with the help of students, did his own repairs and installation, recruited able students and put it all together in what appeared to be a very credible introduction to programming and computers, which was simply called "Data Processing." During all of this, he almost completely left his original assignment which was to teach typing and business math.

This entrepreneurial approach to teaching or to the creation of the

curriculum was not the exception in either school. Many people behaved this way. One followed his interests, recruited his students, marshalled his resources, and put together his curriculum. We could cite just a few more examples. A biology teacher was an avid fisherman and duck hunter, so a large part of his biology class was the study of stream and wildlife ecology. He recounted with pride how much he loved his classes, and his life outside school and how they meshed perfectly, even to the point where the students would come to his house on the St. Clair river to hunt and fish with him, some for years after they had graduated. Another in Pontiac taught American history but particularly liked the period of the second World War. He first started a war games club, they raised some money and bought several expensive games. Then he recruited students into a class in "second World War" which served as a history elective for juniors and seniors. Because of his popularity, the class had already attracted enough for two classes in the 80-81 school year.

Now this can be to some extent simply explained. In neither school was there a fixed curriculum that one took for four years. In Utica one had to accumulate 14 credits in the 10th, 11th and 12th grades, including one credit in science, one in math, three in English, one in U.S. History, one more in social studies and one/half in government or civics. That meant there were six and one half open credits, so there was room, in Utica as well as Pontiac for the creation of classes that particular teachers found interesting. This open elective system encouraged the entrepreneurial approach, with a teacher trying to recruit students for the classes he wanted to teach. The combination of cultural pluralism, which is reflected in an elective system, and high teacher autonomy joined with loose job definition and lack of supervision encouraged teachers who wished to

be normatively involved to create their own curriculum.

Most of those mentioned connected to this entrepreneurial approach to curriculum building have been among those giving normative compliance to their schools. They are among the ones who put the most effort into teaching, and we do not wish to imply that everyone behaved in this way. But that they could have behaved that way demonstrates the potential freedom any single teacher has in the schools, a freedom to proceed in his classes without interference from collegues or supervisors. One could, in effect, follow his own predilections, taking his cues from whatever constituted his relevant field. We use the term "field," as opposed to network because the point is that it was not within a formal or collegial network that one created his approach to curriculum and teaching. Rather it sprang from his own contacts within or without the school, his background, personal opinions, outside constraints and whatever. We do not have a suitable word for it, so we will use the term egocentric field and try to illustrate what we mean.

One of the questions we always asked teachers was "how do you decide to do what you do in the classroom?" They would usually begin by citing the area, or department approved texts, but invariably the differences of opinion as to how to handle c[sses and what to emphasize would emerge. The differences came form a whole host of background elements in the individuals' lives. The teacher of philosophy talked philosophy all the time. He had a strong Catholic background among the Irish of Detroit, read philosophy in his spare time, spoke often of the Socratic admonition about the "unexamined life not being worth living," had strong opinions about the importance of taking his "examined life" perspective into his high school students' lives, and did so in the classroom. His field then,

the sources of his classroom behavior was not idosyncratic, but it was ego-centered. His contacts including his background, his church ties, University of Detroit ties, likes, opinions, education, experience and personal way of relating to students all combined into his classroom behavior and curriculum. The source was not the structure or contacts within the school, save that they were sufficiently uncompelling as to be unable to offset his own field.

A French teacher in Utica took over French III when it had three students and by dint of her energy and hard work built it up to have twenty-three students, a noteworthy enrollment in an advanced foreign language class. She works a sixth class, took the students to Quebec, takes as many as she can to France, has a French club that goes to ethnic restaurants in Detroit, has French dinners for the club in which all the students cook French dishes and speak French during the evening and spends her evenings studying and reading for her class. When asked why, she replies, "Because I want to make French an exciting place. I want the kids to say "Hey, French is a good subject to take; it's fun and exciting; I want it to be the best class in the school." "But why," we ask, and she repeats what she has said. Well, "how" then. She explained that "when it's a conflict between home and the job, my husband stays home and I come to school. If I have to be here at night, he comes with me and we bring the kids. My job always comes first in our family." "And why?" "Because I want them to love French" etc... That is what happened when we pushed the question of why to these teachers who by their own admission and the admission of other teachers and administrators give a great deal to the school. They do it because they want to. The particulars of their

approach to the curriculum come from their own background, in or out of school contacts, hobbies, loves, families; the "why" comes from their own desires to give some of themselves to teaching.

The biology teacher at Utica who lived on the lake was the state president of "Ducks Unlimited" and, as such, influential with people in the Department of Natural Resources. He hunts and fishes all the time, often with students and former students and takes his interests in forests and streams into the classroom. When asked why he gave such enthusiasm to the classroom," he replied,

> "when it gets to be a job, then I quit. I was an embalmer, and a machinist and a shop man, and this is the first job I ever had where I really like to go to work. I never get up and wish I didn't have to go in. Sometimes I feel bad in the morning, but when I get here it goes away. If it doesn't go away right in the beginning then I just give the kids some work and let them go their own way and I cool it for a while until I feel better. I don't do it often, but when I have to I can."

If we pushed a bit further, we would also have to say he simply likes high school students. "I hated teaching junior high school, but here the kid can be a human being and be related to." At this point, he proudly showed me a letter from a student who left last year, but just wrote back from college to tell him about some work in biology they were doing there. Everything came together for him: his interest in biology, in which he had 70 graduate hours from Wayne, avocations, public service, teaching and liking of students. His main life interests all meshed into his teaching. To the question "why do you do what you do in the classroom and take the approach you take" he would verbally construct this ego-centric field where teaching as he taught was extended from and intertwined with a host of other elements in his life. But the answer was not contingent on some other persons on the faculty or in the department.

Of course there were many ties across the faculty of either school but initially we differentiated a network "the totality of all the units connected by a certain type of relationship" from a field, "all the units with which an individual or group maintains a certain type of relationship." We want to continue that dichotomy and explain that the motivating force behind the way one behaved in the classroom was not the network of interrelations in the school, as much as his own egocentric field, consisting of a set of relationships around which he constructed his approach to teaching. For the French teacher it was her students, whom she had personally recruited, her spouse who supported her effort, one other teacher, a man who taught Spanish with whom she arranged trips and sponsored ethnic dinners, and it was her own interest in and enjoyment of teaching French.

For the biology teacher the field was his students, many of whom he knew outside as well as inside school, his connections in state conservation society circles, his family with whom he lived on the lake, and again his own interest in biology and teaching biology. That there was another man who taught in the science department, one who had been his student teacher, who had become a hunting and fishing companion and with whom he cooperated somewhat in lesson planning and coordination of biology I and biology II, was a benefit they both enjoyed. Yet that collegial departmental tie was not compelling in itself. The proof of that was that there was another younger teacher who also taught a section of biology but whom our friend did not like, to whom he did not speak and whom he had warned not "to disturb anything in his lab and to keep your students out of there." Their position on the same faculty, in the same deparament and the same subject meant nothing without the personal ties. It was the same way in

the language department at Utica. A German teacher did not recruit students, was not successful in subscribing her advanced or even intermediate German classes, did not take part in the ethnic dinners or trips and, according to the French teacher, "doesn't do anything." The fact that she was in the same department in the same school was not the compelling element. She just did not give the assignment the same type of normative compliance. Indeed, as far as we could see there was little to demand it. The interesting thing is that after one developed his style and pattern of accommodating to the demands of the job, it went almost unexamined. Our biology teacher reported of his own evaluation..."it's a joke. On the last day of school I sat in Jack's (the principal) office and we wrote it out. He said 'is this OK." and I would say 'yes' and he would write it."

The compartmentalization of teachers and classes contributed most strongly to that. It was brought home one day in the police officer's office in Pontiac, with the policemen alternately on the phone and talking to me, telling me that he was trying to locate a certain "Philip who went home to bet a machine gun to kill Luther" (the boy who had hit the principal over the head). He was worried because he knew that Phil had access to automatic weapons through his father who was a known gun dealer. As we talked, he opened his desk and displayed six or seven knives, a homemade gun, a bag of dope and some chained-together clubs. Also in the room was the data processing teacher, who admitted "I don't even know the kids he's talking about and I never see that kind of stuff in my area... I'm in my own little world up there." "Up there" was his room, with the students he recruited and the machines he bought and the curriculum he created. He was completely isolated from those events. He recounted how he had been in the police office one day and "this kid came in and started mouthing off, and I got on him about it, and I was hard on him too. After

the kid left, the office asked me, 'Do you know who you were taking to?' and I tell him 'No' and he said that that kid had killed two people that they KNEW about and that they couldn't prove it." He reiterated that the world of the police officer was so different and spoke of his students who became interested in computers.

At the center of this egocentric field was the real demand that one develop some way to "get along with kids." There really was not much assistance available in that endeavor. Lortie has described the "sink or swim" characterization of the process of being socialized into teaching.

> One of the striking features of teaching is the abruptness with which full responsibility is assumed. In fact, a young man or woman typically is a student in June and a fully responsible teacher in September. "Beginning teachers" are on probation and usually receive more supervision than their expereinced colleagues, but their daily tasks are esssentially the same. It is no accident that some refer to this as the "sink-or-swim" approach.

Of course, the compartmentalization, with the accompanying lack of supervision, combined with the value neutrality approach to what "should" be learned, contributes to it. If we cannot decide among ourselves what should constitute an education, then we certainly cannot decide how it should be taught. For that reason, while we found many differing attitudes and approaches to teaching, we found no concensus or attempts at consensus on methods or approaches. The speech teacher at Pontiac was a good example. He was assigned to the English department, taught speech and ran the debate club into which he put the kind of time and commitment that is typical of dedicated debate teachers. But his approach to his speech classes was somewhat unique. Students were obligated to give three or four speeches a term, one on their academic life, one on their future, and one on something else, but the teacher reveled in the fact that the students

got up and talked in knowing terms about the most sordid events in their personal lives. He was proud of "this little white girl yesterday who talked about how she babysat for this neighbor who raped her repeatedly over a period of six weeks and how she was afraid to say anything about it because he threatened her...and you should have seen those black kids respond to her and those black boys telling her that if he tried to do anything like that again just to tell them and they'd 'fix his ass'." The next day I attended the class and watched one boy give a speech on his asperations, but, in truth, it was not a speech but was a set of disorganized ramblings..."Well, I wanna open a clothing store, you know, I like clothes and I like to dress up, it's important, you know and"...the teacher was in the back of the room prodding the student on the outline..."does your interest in clothes make you want to do this..?" "Yeah, that's it"...said the student and went on about the type of clothes..."Do you think clothes are important to a person..."well, yeah, you know, when a guy looks good," and the student went on some more, interrupted again by the teacher asking if his ambition was to make a lot of money and the student responded again and went on breifly. It took only a few minutes, and was an unprepared set of ramblings, some connected, some not. There was no outline or formality, no preparation and, what structure it had, came from the teacher coaxing the student into following an outline that he, not the student, had in front of him.

The next student, a young white girl, told a dreadful tale about her mother getting beaten by her father, and, in turn, throwing her and her sister out, and how she turned to a neighbor, who happened to be black, and was taken into their house for the duration of this squabble. It was supposed to be a speech on racial harmony or something like that, but

again the teacher maintained his steady questioning of the girl in front to keep her utterings moderately structured.

When he spoke of his efforts, which is to teach "an English elective for kids you can't read" (that is the way he put it), he spoke glowingly of their openness with one another, of the affection that came through to one who had told of his or her sorry plight, of how his elective was one of the best subscribed classes in the schools, of how though he was white, his clientele was almost entirely black "except for a few strong whites," and how what the kids needed most "was someone who understands where they were coming from and who could talk to them." When he spoke to them of their expereinces, he used a street argot, referring to their "ladies," the pimping and prostitution, drugs, welfare, and ADC. This teacher also worked long after school hours on debate, had a creditable debate record in a league that contained many top debate teams in the state, spent his own funds for extra curricular activities, served as the school's tennis coach, and was in general a highly regarded professional.

This curriculum, the content of his classes, was only tangentially speech or forensics; rather, it was an elucidation of the students' lives, or as he put it, it was "where the kids are at." That was the content he reveled in: his success at getting them to articulate their lives, particularly the seamier side, and empathize with one another, particularly across the racial barrier. In his opinion, that was the way to teach school to "these kids."

From this gentleman and others who took an equally unique approach to curriculum, we tried to get an answer to the question, "Why do you stress this aspect of students' lives rather than any number of other things." His answer was stated in terms of belief that "this is important," "this is where they're at," "this is what they need," "this is what they relate

to," "this is good for kids." "I'm getting them ready for life." A teacher in Utica had spent some considerable time and energy organizing a set of activities to raise money for a girl stricken with a kidney disease. While that activity was disparaged by some who openly wondered why time and energy were being wasted that way, that teacher simply said that "If a need like that isn't what we're here for, I don't know what is."

We never found anyone who subjected his beliefs to an empirical test, or a test of consensus among the faculty. They were simple statements of their own values concerning students, schooling, and their own role in the process. Indeed, the speech teacher might have been right. Perhaps the students who were poor readers did need sympathy or at least empathy, did need the relatedness, the personal expression of affection from peers, and the non-threatening atmosphere, where, if they had not bothered to prepare an outline and address that outline in a speech, then the teacher would find a way to pretend that they had expended some effort and interjected some imagination. He would add what they lacked and they would pass the course.

Of course, as we indicated in the previous section, the school had no mechanism to address the question of what students "really" needed, so what ever the teacher did was acceptable. At the bottom of this appraoch was the teacher's own value set, the genesis of which we can only guess at, but he was free to select those elements from his background, his education, his role, his perspective, his experience, his contacts with other teachers, with students, perhaps with teachers in other schools, with his family or whomever and create this ego-centered field from whence came his approach to curriculum.

Another teacher would create a different approach in teaching social studies. Mr. N was highly structured. His students learned to recite and write the pledge of allegiance, the preamble to the constitution and the bill of rights and also saluted the flag. He spoke contempously about conditions in the school, about the lack of standards of dress and deportment, of students who were allowed to run the halls, of the lack of discipline..."if any teacher ever gets hurt here and he gets a smart lawyer, he'll be able to retire rich, because it will come out in public just what's allowed to go on in this school." One of the few teachers whom I found to be living in the Pontiac district, Mr. N did not send his own children to the schools. "I wouldn't sacrifice my children to a social experiment run by a pack of incompetents." At considerable cost he sent them to a Catholic school in the suburbs. His classes were structured and orderly, discourse was civil, one student spoke at a time, students were not allowed to come in late without a pass or leave early, and at least some homework was expected even from those in the non-college bound classes where some were barely literate. He disparaged the students' level of knowing, saying that "all they can do is yell some empty slogan and in some place that passes for knowing something." He intended and followed through in teaching them some appreciation of America along with the American history lessons.

Mr. L's value set came through in his teaching. He had been born in Austria and, when seven years old in 1945, was in the Volksturm digging traps to stop Russian tanks. The tanks, of course, were not stopped. "You should have seen it, we worked for days on those traps and the first tank just went around them." Though Mr. L's family came to Detroit, he never forgot his background in Austrian schools. "I remember discipline,

there's no discipline in here, I go home and tell my relatives in Gratz what goes on here and they don't believe it." Assigned first to German and social studies, he was now teaching five classes of social studies, because of the decline of interest in German, and disparaging the quality of the students or of his own ability to teach them anything. He still tried to get them into normative compliance with what he valued. He spoke wistfully of the time when they had students like Bob Sullivan who, when Mr. L was talking "about the Romans sending 40,000 troops into Gaul in the summer of 9 AD, and this student raised his hand and said 'I think you're wrong Mr. L, it must have been spring of 9AD because the calander then was three months off from the calander now'....we'll never have students like that anymore." "Now you can't get them to study. I tell them find a quiet place at home, turn off the television, read the material. If there's something you don't understand read it again. Come in after class and ask and I'll find time to help you or give you some material you can understand better... do they do it?" "No, they don't do it, most of them don't have a quiet place to study, many can't read, and some don't even care. I asked them to write down ten occupations that they like and a number of them didn't even want to do anything."

Mr. L's referents were the days when "the Jewish kids were still here," (before integration) "they all left in 1968" when one could assign homework and expect to have it done, "when the kids cared about learning." He recounted a non-typical incident about a girl: "Carol W. missed 55 classes out of a possible 84 so far this year, was tardy (reading his book) a total of 9 times in addition to the 55 absences, and the last time she turned in any work...was on Oct. 17th" (three months prior). When I told her she would fail, her mother went to the principal and told him she

didn't think her daughter should fail. "They can put a lot of pressure on you" said another teacher present..."Oh they can, I went in to see him and he said 'Well, you can fail her but do you think it's really necessary?' And then he said it again and the third time he said 'really' I got the message." Or another girl who "came from the back of the room and ran right over another girl, and I grabbed her and she swung and the father came in and tried to accuse me of assault. "That's what goes on here."

He still tries to instill in them the things he values, the reading, the value of learning for learning's sake, the virtue of discipline and self-restraint, but at the same time he continually disparages his students and their unwillingness or inability to come up to his standards. The teachers such as Mr. R in his speech classes or Mr. D who gives them the poetry of Gill Scott Heron do not do that. Their choice was to "take the kids where they are, to give them what is relative to them" even if it means giving them a poem by Heron entitled "Niggars Love To Say Fuck," or letting them recount the most sordid aspects of their lives and calling it content.

There were a number, as we mentioned, who considered themselves to be academics, who upheld standards, assigned homework, spoke nostalgically of the "old Central High" and the students we had in '68 before "like Bob Sullivan," "like the Jewish students," like the children of parents who left when integration and busing began. Since then the population of Central had dropped from 3000 to 2100. The school erupted into racial violence a number of times. Many of those who left were white and a good part of that population were the students with whom Mr. N and Mr. L identified.

The effect of that leaving accentuated what we are trying to describe

here. It fragmented the value system and further isolated teachers from one another. There were those who, by their own estimates there were the same number, referred to the pre 68 school "the old building", as a good place where one principal could handle all the discipline, where there was a sense of community among staff, where teachers supported and helped one another. Now whether this was true or whether it was just a nostalgia for a time when one was young and life held more promise, we cannot say. But in that new building with its five by five schedule, its isolation of teachers in their rooms, and with the lack of co-membership, the teachers relied on their own value set and developed an unscrutinized and egocentric method of teaching. Those who reported themselves as among the academically inclined teachers could disparage the other teachers' approaches all they wanted. But with no consensus on what was or was not appropriate, each developed his classes as he wished. While one might not like what went on in another's class, there was no common framework in which to discuss it.

It may appear that we have gone too far in stressing the uniqueness of each teacher's approach. Both schools had an "established" curriculum, and both had a set of procedures for altering that curriculum. Pontiac had an assistant principal for curriculum, and if one wanted to initiate a new course, then he went to that person with the idea, further developed the course with that principal's cooperation, and depended on the principal to work that course into the curriculum. In Utica there was a department structure, a system-wide department structure, and a curriculum committee run by the director of secondary education. A new offering, a change in texts, or the removal of a course went through a process that might take some months and might receive careful scritiny, particularly from the

system-wide curriculum committee. And too, the schools were allocated a certain number of teachers based on the number of students. Given the standard curriculum, it was then the principal's task (in Utica) or the assistant principal's (in Pontiac), to schedule the curriculum with what staff was available. These procedures were fairly orderly, and from our observations were well followed in both places.

However, even with these formal procedures, our point still stands. For one reason, while the curriculum in either school may be referred to as "standard," there is really nothing standard about it. Beyond the basic subjects, the curriculum is a compilation of all the diverse efforts of all the individual teachers, past and present. That this curriculum stands published and offered publically to students does not mean that there is some system-wide rationale or even school-wide collective understanding of its appropriateness. Any change, any innovation still came from individuals following there own predelictions. The energy that altered the curriculum was always generated from one person, not allocated by the structure. If no teacher wanted to change something in Utica, the curriculum committee did not take the initiative. In Pontiac, the assistant principal, who was in charge of scheduling, evaluations, testing, and running the present curriculum, did not initiate changes. Those still depended on individual teachers. A second reason for the diversity, was the lack of coordination, control, supervision or standardization. If a course is entered in, years could go by, and no one in any position of authority ever asked "what is happening in that class?" So with that kind of system, while there is the appearance of some uniformity, there is much more diversity and individuality than is ever admitted.

There is an additional reason why different approaches were not

discussed, particularly in Pontiac where there was the additional factor of race and potential for racial conflict. The issue was race and the different attitudes toward and accommodation to black students and a biracial school. We were not very successful in pushing the issue in interviews because many denied it or simply refused to acknowledge it, but the issue of race and racial conflict created some problem. When the administrators talked about it, they would downplay its importance and display their discipline and attendance summaries, showing that as many white got into trouble as blacks and as many females as males. According to them, although the community thinks "that all the trouble here is racial, it isn't--it's drug related. One guy owns a certain spot in the hallway in the morning and that's where he deals. If someone else starts to cut in a fight starts."

The principal would not admit racism aloud. In a faculty meeting where the topic was the fifth consecutive millage defeat, one black teacher raised his hand and suggested "there are three reasons for it, the first is elitism, the second is racism..." The principal stopped him saying, "That kind of talk does no one any good, because the school has to take the kids that they're sent." It did no good to talk about racism or its effects where half the school was black. Some teachers spoke with pride about their biracial classes, they being white and proud of their good reputation among black students. Others pointed to the black students, in general, as unwilling or unable to handle academic work..."Let's face it, these kids just do not come from a place where those things are valued. There's nothing we can do about it."

It was not that there was racism or prejudice, but racial lines and the accommodations to biracialness certainly fragmented the faculty. One

never saw black and white teachers eating together when the students had gone. The students too were divided into their informal cliques along racial lines.

When we talked about whites having moved to the suburbs, it was these white teachers who are among them or who if they did not move to the suburbs, send their children to the non-public schools. There was friendship, affection and great respect among some whites for some blacks and it went both ways so our point is not that teachers themselves were racist, as much as that biracialness was a fragmenting element in the school, contributing to the value isolation of each person. Also, because of the nature of the events and the history of the racial problems in the school, it was not something that could be discussed openly for fear of the charge of racism. A teacher said privately, "Hell, everybody knows it isn't the white kids that are running up and down halls and assaulting the black kids. But nobody says anything about it." And he was right. It was not even admissable. It contributed to the further deterioration of whatever community there might have been ir the school.

It was not unlike the fact that skill level among the students at Central was low. In that school only 47% of the students scored 75% or higher on the language arts part of the Michigan Educational Assessment Test, which is a test of minimal skills, and only 37% of them scored 75% or higher on the math test. Those are not good scores; in fact, they were the lowest in the county. Like race, this low level of academic skills was something that each teacher had to accommodate and the accommodation was an individual thing which further fragmented the staff. Not only was a teacher isolated in his classroom and expected to figure out his own way of dealing with students, but in Pontiac there were also two

additional elements, biracialness and low achievement, about which there was no consensus on the faculty. One could not "bring up" race or achievement beacuse there was no consensus on either matter.

The important of "academics" in either school was a matter of some dispute. Our message has been that one did or did not emphasize scholarship, depending on this values and predelictions. But a number of teachers in either school were of the opinion that a strong academic approach to a subject matter was positively discouraged and downplayed in favor of an activities or "student" approach. This was particularly true in Utica where some who did stress academic achievement felt that they were not among the more favored. Sometime before, one of them had been the target of an attempt by the principal to have her moved from the building in favor of someone with less experience who could coach the cheerleaders, and none of them had forgotten that incident.

At one time in 1965 there has been a superintendent who valued academic achievement and encouraged the pursuit of academic accomplishment, but who had a limited view of schools and would close them at four o'clock, not letting anyone in the community use them without paying. This superintendent could not pass a millage, was disliked by the community and he was subsequently fired. According to a long time teacher, "He was literally run out of town. They hated him because he was allied with the old power center, the Lutheran church and the farmers, and he had no feel for the changing power structure, for the real estate and development interests who wanted to have some say in the schools." The next superintendent, "a man with a grey flannel head who didn't give a damn about academics," but who knew how to relate to people, made the schools the center of the community, popularized the curriculum, and passed millages. In the process he downplayed the importance of academic achievement among

teachers or students. As one friend pointed out, one cannot popularize and maintain a strong academic program. As examples he pointed to the fact that a second master's in history would not move one up the salary schedule, but a second master's in guidance or administration would move one up. And having been the union officer who had filed the grievance, he explained that the administrator's position was that one could teach history adequately with a bachelor's degree and there was not reason to pay for a second master's in history after one was already on the master's schedule with a MA in education.

He pointed out a young history teacher who "was encouraged to become the administrator's stalking horse for career education, which is just a fad" and "discouraged from pursuing a serious interest in history." What he was disparaging was the "activites mentality," where administrators valued most highly those teachers who worked on cheerleading and clubs, and to the extent that they could, rewarded those teachers. At the same time, they valued least those teachers who held up standards of academic achievement but who in the process may have appeared not to "like kids," or who antagonized kids, and of course who may wind up sending kids to the office, which causes the administrator trouble. This was a hard issue to follow. When we tried we found that some of those whom our friend identified as academicians did indeed agree that the pursuit of academics was not valued, but they did not see the younger teachers' involvement in activities as negative, saying rather that they were happy to see someone take responsibility for the plays, the pompom girls, the assemblies and the variety shows. The teacher who did take career education said that it did not get in the way of his study of history. In fact, he was pursuing a master's degree in history at Wayne State. So while we then downplayed

it as an important issue, in our opinion, the fact that a teacher may involve himself or herself heavily in out of class activities has an effect similar to the race-achievement issues in Pontiac. The way one chooses to construct his pattern of accommodation is really his own concern. The other note is that while there are some teachers in either school who consider themselves academically inclined, they did not constitute a referent for other teachers and did not set and maintain standards beyond their own rooms. In fact, we can honestly say that in all the time we spent in either school, no one person ever said anything like "you should go see so and so, he or she is a great teacher." The said that another was "demanding" or "poor" or "flaky" or "lacked control" or "was popular" or was "an academician," but no one ever used an unabashedly laudatory term when referring to another. We found teachers whom we thought were great, but no concensus existed about them or anyone else on the faculties. And too, there was no general sense among the teachers even of an academic group in the schools. One might identify himself or herself that way, and point to others who had a similar perspective, but, combined, they were not identified that way by others or in general. Opinions of that self-identified group varied as much as opinions of the other teachers.

It is certainly true that the administrators have their own reasons to value teachers who "get along well with kids." These are the people who do not send kids to the office, who do not cause scheduling problems because of their inability or unwillingness to take the harder classes, who support the activities, help out with the variety show, go to the graduation and the prom, take cafeteria duty when asked, and are simply more flexible in their dealings with the students and the schedule. It is also true that teachers who held up a strong academic ideal, who demand homework, quiet, writing skills and who do not give good grades

without effort, are more likely to antagonize students, to have students trying to get out of their classes, to have conflict with students in class which may lead to trouble in the office. It is true that in those schools, the administrators did refer to a number of those who considered themselves academicians as "not liking kids." Some of those who were academically inclined simply took the issue philosophically. As one of them said, "What can you do in a place where you have to take everyone and keep everyone happy?"

Reiterated, our argument is that there were no forces in either school sufficiently compelling to draw people together. If it were to be different, if teachers were to draw together to create some consistent approaches based on common beliefs, then there would have to be some forces in the school that would compell them to do so. But there are none. Neither in Pontiac or Utica was there any compulsion to work together to formulate a uniform approach to teaching, or a standard way to relate to students, or some opinion as to what was or was not acceptable behavior for either students or teachers.

This is the main reason why we changed the purpose of the study. Originally we stated that "the purpose of the study is to describe and explain the human networks that intervene between the stated and pursued goals of two secondary schools, and the activities, instructional and otherwise, that take place as a result of those state and pursued goals." The problem was that that depended on there actually being some goals and some process by which these goals were worked through the faculty, and some result of the goals and the working through. But things or issues or events did not work their way through the faculty, not things that were curricular or programmatic. The schools did not operate that way. The sum of the forces we have discussed, the schedule, the lack of super-

vision or, we might better say, the taking up of supervisory time with student discipline, the isolation of teachers in the classroom, the lack of common values among teachers regarding student behavior, achievement, biracialness, appropriate educational goals, standard opinions of curriculum, or what was "good for the KIds," combined to fragment the concensus. Yet, at the same time, no force served to build concensus. To build a consistent concensus would have required purposeful activity, teacher recruitment with value consensus in mind, a great deal of time and effort and perhaps a less diverse environment, none of which were available. So the teacher was free to go off, build his own appraoch to classes and curriculum, his own way of relating to students, and was then free to justify it in his own terms. One's day was sufficiently busy and one was sufficiently isolated from other teachers during that working time so that we do not believe the case is overstated. That the school looked more uniform than it was, was a function of the schedule, the room arrangement, and the requirements that one take some English or social studies or some sequence of courses. But underneath that very thin uniformity was a great amount of diversity; correspondingly, there was no mechanism to create a uniformity out of that diversity.

It is not that there were no issues. It is that the issues did not go through the faculty. An issue that occurred in Pontiac as a result of five consecutive millage defeats was a severe cut in funds. This meant the deletion of all sports and extra curricular activities. This was important to many teachers, particularly those such as the newspaper sponsor who had his publication cut, the football coach who lost his team, the wrestling coach who saw his best man go to a school in the suburbs, or the basketball coach who lost his best players to the suburbs. The cuts hit the school, but they hit individual teachers, not the faculty.

At a late winter school board meeting it was pointed out to the board that Pontiac Central was not having a musical production this year, unlike previous years when they had had quite expensive productions. There had been money raised privately to sponsor extra-curricular activities but most of that money had been used on sports. The board asked the superintendent why there was no production. At that point he promised that there would be one and the newspapers made sure that his promise was made public. He proceeded to see the principal and then Mr. U, who had always sponsored the musical. But according to Mr. U, when the superintendent tried to "intimidate" him into sponsoring a play and started the conversation by saying "since you don't understand the process I'll explain it to you." What the superintendent did not know was that Mr. U, a thirteen year teacher who had already been pink slipped for the coming year, was already discouraged with plays, with not having enough students to warrent the effort, with the fact that only six or seven faculty members bothered to come and "last year only one administrator even bothered to showup", and he had already decided not to even try to sponsor the play. So when the superintendent started to "explain the process"....."I was just sitting there getting madder and madder and finally I let him have it. I told him I would not sponsor a play, there was not enough time and that not in all the years I'd been doing it did I every hear from anybody, not one note of congratulations all those years, and now when it's not going on they get all excited." When the superintendent countered, "what would you think if I told you they were having a play at Northern High?" I just laughed at him and told him all he wanted was some five week thing, that he didn't care about quality and I just wouldn't put on some simple thing in five weeks," and they've cut and cut

and now it was going to start hurting them." Finally I told him that I didn't care what he did, I've already been pink slipped." He added that at that point, the superintendent said to his assistant "c'mom Mr. J, these guys are too tough for us"...and that after he did that he "felt better than he had in weeks."

This was an important issue in the school. It was noted by the board and made the newspapers. In fact it was used as an example not only of the decreasing program in the high schools, but also as exemplifing the taking of the available funds by the athletic departments while further denying funds to other worthwhile activities. But in the school, it effected only one teacher, Mr. U, and a junior high teacher who had choreographed for him. Other teachers were interested and applauded Mr. U's action, but when there was a production they had not bothered to come, nor had the building administrators, nor had the central office people. Mr. U and his interested students put it on, their personal friends and family attended, and although done in the name of the school, it was questionable whether it could be called a "school event." With the loss of Mr. U, there simply was not a musical that year.

Pontiac had been hard hit by the millage defeats and in May of '80 had to advance the 80-81 state aid to finish the 79-80 school year. But the matter of extra curricular activites was interesting, because it followed the same pattern as did the classes. A teacher became interested in an activity, created it, recruited to sustain it, often raised his own funds through candy and flower sales for its sustenance, and ran it by himself. There was some instutitional support for major activities like yearbooks and newspapers, but even there, the approach to the activity and the final product was the reflection of the individual teacher, and most

events "belonged" to one teacher. In Utica the lady who sponsored the school newspaper produced what was considered to be a high-quality school paper. She taught the journalism class as an English elective for students who wanted to work on the paper, accepted a budget of $700.00 from the school, which she considered inadequate, and therefore, supplemented her funds with the sale of candy and flowers. She found her own printer, made contacts with some people in the central office to use a typesetting machine, used her personal funds to take students to weekend seminars on student journalism, and was in the process of writing a grant requesting state funds for support of a district-wide communications coordinator, a job she hoped to fill. In the process, of course, she was trying to divorce herself even more from departmental responsibilities of teaching non-journalism classes. There was some conflict between her and the yearbook editor who wanted some of the same equipment, and with her and the principal who felt she was badgering him for more funds than were necessary for a student paper ("Christ, she wants to put out the Detroit News up there") and between her and some other English teachers who did not think she should be allowed to leave the dpeartment. But her newspaper, which was very good and which she worked long extra hours on, was a major element in her life; she created it the way she wanted it, even in addition to her own family job of raising her children and being supportive to a husband who taught and coached in a neighboring district; even with the burden of raising $200 to $400 a month extra with the candy and flower sales and the dances to give her the support she felt she needed; even having to borrow and maintain equipment and having to teach her own four classes.

"All that for $14,000." "Why?" we asked. The answer is the same. She spoke of the relationships with students, of her own high school years in which she was yearbook editor and considered it a great educational expereince, of her won surplus energy and of her unwillingness to do less than an exemplary job. So she took an undefined assignment to "put out a paper," a modest budget, and one class period, and turned it into a full-time job.

Whenever we talked to people like the newspaper sponsor we always asked about the reward they got from this expenditure of time, creativity, and energy. The answers were phrased in personal terms: they did it "for the kids,""for the satisfaction," for the pleasure, because "that's the kind of person I am," because "I like it." The answers were always phrased in terms of a personal realtionship with students. The head of the athletic department at Pontiac opened the gym to students whenever he could, availed himself to students, bought his wrestlers dinner from his own pocket during trips, and worked in the gym on weekends and evenings for little or no money, just "to keep it open for kids." He recounted his own childhood in Polish Chicago, and how hard the thirties, the time of his childhood, were for the poeple there with no work. He recounted what football had done for him, how otherwise he never would have gone to the University of Illinois, nor would he have graduated if he had gone. He saw the students at Central as needing the same kind of participation in and guidance from sports as he had had.

At one point in the study we wanted to say that the teachers all liked the students, or at least, they said they did and that this "liking" served as the main motivator. But it is not that simple. The fact is that they almost all say they like kids, but the kids they like may be either present or long gone, real or hypothetical. Even for those who are real

and present, different teachers respond to different ones. Not only do they not have any uniform view of education, they do not have the students in mind when they profess to "like kids." Mr. L referred a few times to Bob Sullivan and pointed with pride to one of his former students whose picture appeared in Time magazine with the boy (now a priest) accompanying Pope John Paul. His referent remained there when he had the students to whom he related, but now, as he spoke of his college prep class of 31 students, "only ten passed and the highest grade was a 'D'." Others would report their discouragement at the fact that "for these kids Farrah no longer being on "Charlie's Angels" is a current event." "I asked for political cartoons that I could turn into overhead display and I didn't get one." And again..."For extra credit I asked them to go to a grocery store and price a typical grocery list and not one kid did it." Others would say that it was unfair to "hold an intellectual mirror up to these kids," and say that "the school changed and we have to change, we have to teach the kids they send us." That particular teacher quoted, a highly regarded English teacher who taught creative writing and looked for and found talent among some of the "hard cases," as they were called. He found Luther, the boy who hit the principal from behind, and had been sent to state prison for rape and abduction, to be a sensitive and thoughtful boy who "responded well to praise...when he came in he had only one kid in here he related to, another street kid like himself, and it took them a while to establish themselves in the class, they looked around a lot, but he worked well...and he wrote some sensitive lines." The special education teacher in Utica would point to his former students who "had disappeared into the community and new lead productive lives." The coaches could point to students who had gone on to excell in college

athletics or to those who had straightened out as a result of their benign influence. "This one kid, all of his brothers dropped out of school, then his sister was dropping out and his parents didn't care, but I got hold of him, kept him wrestling for me and he's still in school and going to graduate". "What do you do with him?" "Tell him to stay in school and try to graduate," I work with him, try to get him to do better, I talk to him and encourage him. Now the other teachers come to me when that have a problem with him and I take care of it." That one student and a few like him that the wrestling coach can touch become his referent. He likes his biology classes but admits that he "can't touch kids that you have for only 45 mintues, not like you can when you coach them through a sport all season."

Our point is that while they phrased their teaching in terms of a generalized referent "kids," they always spoke of a very select set of individual students for whom they worked and from whom they evoked the kind of response they wanted. The students were as diverse as were the approaches. One liked those with whom he fished and hunted, another those who went on to good schools, or gave evidence of wanting to go to good schools, the band teacher at Utica of those who gave evidence of loving the music as did he and who would come out on "rainy Friday evenings, for community events on weekends, summer camp " and join into a community of music lovers, the wrestling coach of those who confided in him, were open and friendly and treated him as they would an older brother.

This student referent was important for two reasons: first, because it was possible to develop an affective community - a gemeinshaft with a few students and in that gemeinshaft the teacher could find the personal rewards, and second, because no matter how diverse one'e approach to the

position, he could always point to those few students and justify his style of teaching. We said before that people justified what they did in terms of being "good for kids," but it was not just the general body of students past and present they had in mind. It was a set of particular students who had responded in kind to that teacher, who had given her what she wanted.

In both schools the student body was sufficiently diverse so that one could hope to find students there who would give it back. One had a field which came from all those things in his or her background and perspective and experience in teaching, and one had a referent group. One could call it a second field of students, some real, some hypothetical, some past, some present, who justified the first field. Teachers could not cut themselves off from those students who did not join with them or give back what they hoped, but they could treat those students decently if perfunctorily, while still holding out that hope for and promise of personal affective relation, for those who would come over and join in with their endeavor. With that kind of a referent, one did not need the support of his fellow teachers; not only was it not available, but also one did not need it. He had his style, his students, his unsupervised isolation, and was therefore reasonably free to pursue his courses as he wished and his teaching as he wished, allowing him to find those students who responded and justify his position with reference to them.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to describe and explain networks among the professional staffs of two secondary schools. Further, our intent was to do this by isolating some "events" such as changes in policy

new curricula, program development or staff changes, and see how these events originated, how they wended their way through the faculty and what came out at the other end. That middle process, the wending through the faculty, was to be the subject matter of the study because it was there that the networks would be revealed. But when we entered the school, we found that it was not that simple. Rather in those comprehensive schools with a diversified curriculum, designed to give their communities what they want, responding to community pressures for alterations in the curriculum or alternations in the rule enforcement, where the administrators in one school spent all their time on attendance and discipline, and in the second at least half on that, leaving the teachers not only isolated by the schedule, but unsupervised in their efforts, issues did not get processed through a faculty. In fact each person, within the very broad assignment to teach either some assigned course in the department, or some specialities which he or she developed, was fairly free to develop a classroom style which was a product of his or her own background, inclinations, training and perspective and then proceed to conduct his classes following this style. It was not a matter of working issues through some communal faculty or some departmental network or even through some informal network. It was not the networks that generated and processed the curriculum, it was the egocentric fields. As we explained, there was no uniform opinion of what constituted an "appropriate education," nor what constituted being "good for kids."

The first part of our model consists of describing this field from whence came one's perspective toward his job. The second part of the explanation is that either during or after one developed a style, he could justify it in terms of being "good for kids," by pointing to specific

students, past or present, who had responded to and benefitted from his or her efforts. This set of students, too, was part of the teacher's field, but as we explained it, constituted a second level of field. The first level is the genesis of the style, while the second level is the contacts with those students for whom it was good. Hence when one said it was "good for kids" he could point out, in person, those kids of whom he spoke. At this stage of our case, that the egocentric field, and not the networks, was the center of the school is stated somewhat too strongly. As our description proceeds we will temper that. But for the present our explanatory model consists of two elements: first, the teacher's egocentric field, and second, a set of personal relations with students, a second level of field, which supports and justifies the first field.

PART II

In part One, there is an implication which we did not intend, but which remains nonetheless. That is that the school is composed of teachers who give the greater part of their energy to teaching. However, that may not be the case. The fact is that many of the teachers who we contacted had demanding and time consuming occupations outside of their regular teaching. In Utica one teacher ran a driving school, one owned a bar, one a tax accounting business, one worked at a race track, one worked (full time) for the Post Office, another (full time) for the phone company, a few taught driving for the man who owned the driving school, two repaired cars, one taught night school, one was a cabinet maker, another a welder, one raised dogs, another hung doors, one was a "folk" musician, another had a band, another was in politics, another built race cars, and two owned farms.

This phenomenon of teachers having two jobs is not much discussed in educational literature but we believe it to be an important one, and quite capable of effecting the curriculum. Since our argument is that the strongest force in the curriculum is the teachers' individual field, then a time consuming and serious job can be a powerful influence on the curriculum. While we cannot demonstrate that this or that particular job resulted in a particular behavior, we can argue that many outside jobs were done during the week. That they were not only time consuming, but an individual endeavor, and that there were some who carried on their second jobs on school time, coming late or leaving early, and using their lunch or free period for these outside businesses.

Those that had outside jobs frequently talked to their school friends about the particulars, the profits, the losses, the hope for improved performance, or the worthwhileness of them compared to school. Some who did not have them disparaged those who did..."I don't see how he can look himself in the mirror in the morning, all he does now is his business." It was said that some central office administrators were upset about some teachers and felt the individuals were neglecting their teaching responsibilities. However, when we asked the superintendent he did not have anything to say about it, nor was any action ever taken to stop anyone. Teachers had their contract which allowed them to do what they wished after 2:30, and there was so little supervision that if one worked on something other than his classes during his free periods, then he could do so with impunity.

It is not that the teachers in general were abusing their position; indeed, some of those with the most demanding outside positions gave the most time to after-school activities and events and would point with pride to individual students whom they had helped in personal relations. Per-

haps they were just being careful, knowing that the were susceptible to criticism or perhaps they were simply more energetic than others. That some teachers and administrators resent it and suspect that the school is being cheated of effort and time that it paid for, does not suffice to bring it out for open discussion. What would be needed to bring it out would be a sense of "we-ness" among the faculty. There would have to be some consensus that "that is not the way we behave here." But that did not exist, so while some do not like it, there really is nothing they can do about it.

In our counting of those whom we knew had second jobs, there were 22 people listed, from a faculty of 68. But there are other categories of jobs, that is, jobs within the school. In addition to the twenty-two people whom we mentioned, there were seven department chairmen, an activities director, a union representative, a newspaper sponsor and a yearbook sponsor. Then there were three business and industrial teachers who also taught co-op education which assists students in attaining part time jobs, and keeps them under employer and school supervision. These co-op teachers were given some additional expense funds, an office and a last period free to pursue their out-of-school contacts. Also there were some professionally related out-of-school activities. Four teachers, one each from industrial arts, Spanish, business and band served as system-wide department chairmen, and four were pursuing Ph.D.'s at Wayne State University. Then there were the coaches, twelve individuals in all. In addition there were three people, two men and one woman, who worked for the athletic department, keeping score, taking tickets or assisting with coordinating events.

In addition, there were a number of female teachers (we counted twelve but we believe there are more) who not only had working husbands and young children but who still maintained the major responsibility for

domestic duties. A few of those reported that their husband's job was much more important than their own, a few even saying they would quit as soon as their husbands were far enough up the income ladder.

We have now itemized sixty-eight positions including those within and without the school, sixty-eight jobs that these teachers carried on in addition to their teaching position. But in many cases one or more of these were held by the same person. The athletic director ran the driving school and coached golf. The man who worked at the race track worked Co-Op. The newspaper and yearbook sponsor had demanding families. The man who served as system-wide business department chairman was also in-school chairman and also worked co-op. The chairman of the industrial arts department worked as a cabinet maker. A man who worked for the athletic department also pursued a Ph.D. Another who pursued a Ph.D. also served as a system-wide department chairman. One who raised dogs coached two sports. One who was the head basketball coach worked full time for the post office. The activities director owned a bar. The tax accountant owned a farm. The woman who coordinated special education raised horses. A guidance counselor was chairman of that department.

We have not even counted the many male teachers who had working spouses and at least somewhat increased domestic responsibilities, or the serious avocations pursued by some, e.g., the man who worked with the state conservation agencies, or the personal responsibilities that everyone has with his personal needs, his house, car, parents, children, recreation, and three who had serious health problems. We have limited the evidence to citing double and triple jobs, but those other elements do enter into the argument. The fact is that these teachers lead very complex lives which were fragmented into very different parts. The parts themselves,

with some notable exceptions which we will discuss later in athletics and activities, are held together and mesh into an individual's field, but they do not cross into the fields of others on the faculty.

One does not have much room for co-membership with other faculty when he has a working spouse and an accompanying increased domestic responsibility, a second job either within or without the school, and a demanding avocation such as pursuit of a higher degree. Rather he has an ego-centered field of greater complexity, greater demand, and similarly less time and flexibility to give himself to other endeavors that might require participation.

The fact is that for a great majority of the staff in that school, teaching was a serious endeavor but only one of two or three serious endeavors in his or her life. For some, we suspect, although we have no proof, that it was not even the major endeavor. Rather their lives were compartmentalized out: teaching had its place, but that place ended at 2:30 or 3:00 at the latest; then there were ranges of other things that were equally interesting, equally demanding and equally rewarding to be attended to. Hence our original argument that the important locus for curricular development is the ego-centric field and not the faculty collective or network, is strengthened because, as we say, the ego-centric fields were quite complex and demanding and even more egocentric than first apparent. We would add one thing. Most of the teachers, in Utica and Pontiac do not live in the school district in which they taught, but in some suburb or distant division of the metropolitan area. Hence, their churches, their volunteer organizations, their children's activities and the community affiliations are not in the district and do not cross into the lives of others on the faculty. Our belief is that complexity of

each person's field left a limited amount of time and energy for school.

This is difficult to prove because we do not have the direct evidence that proves a cause-effect relationship between the field that an individual teacher has and the amount of compliance and enthusiasm he or she gives in the classroom. But there is some evidence that can be presented in negative form which we will mention briefly now, but reserve for the following section on teachers and their relations to other teachers. Our point will be that these other constraints prevented one from giving more to the school, and attempts to make them do so met with no avail. In general, teachers did not return to activities, athletic events, graduation, senior play, senior night, athletic banquets, award nights or honor society evenings. The great majority did not volunteer for extra activities or extra duties and did not engage with their colleagues in the development and changing of school. There was some of that, a small amount considering the size of the organization, but people had their own lives and school played a limited part in those lives.

The implication is that because of all these other constraints, there is a lower degree of compliance to the job of teaching. That is not quite fair, because in the conversations, we found that those with the most demanding extra schedules are extremely vociferous in their defense of themselves as teachers who "like kids," "give kids what they need," "prepare kids for the world, the real world," and, in their own way, give extra hours. Indeed, given the lack of any standard, they might very well be right. What is left then is not an accusation against some people who have more to do than others or who may have a higher energy level, but the strengthened thesis that the outside duties, responsibilities and ties are such that one's field is even more egocentric and more removed from that of his colleagues than we first indicated. We do not want to say

that those with greater outside responsibilities give less compliance; they may, but they may not. We have no way of knowing or judging. But we do say that given those other elements there is a greater range of accommodation to the job and fewer ties across the faculty.

Another implication of our first section has been that students find a relationship of some sort with teachers, but what we found in both schools was that highly motivated stadents, those who joined in normatively to the business of learning what the teacher had to teach were, according to teachers, in the minority. In Pontiac the estimate was that there were 200 to 300 students who cared, who would take the harder courses, take some interest in learning and generally give back to the teachers what they wanted. In Utica, a school of 1500 students, the estimate was about the same. Of course most of those who made the estimate were the teachers who taught the harder classes and considered themselves among the "academics." In fact those students who would join in and give back that normative compliance were highly competed for among those teachers. As explained, one was free to start his class and recruit his students, but many could recruit only those who cared about being recruited, for whom school was not simply a burden to be borne or a place to be with one's friends. So if the honors history which T wanted was to start, then he would be recruiting the same students that other teachers wanted for honors English, chemistry, band, physics or trig. The limited number of these students put a definite brake on teachers' ability to create the kind of program he or she wanted. A woman in Pontiac wanted to start a Shakespeare course but the students just were not there. That limited number was either taking philosophy or was taking an English course called "Tradition and Revolution in Literacure," or senior writing. It did not make any sense to take poor students into the class.

In another incident, one day when the cross country coach in Utica was getting ready for an after school meet, a student approached and told him.."I can't make it this afternoon." "You what?" "I have to go take care of my grandmother who just got out of the hospital because my mom has to take my little sister to skating practice." The coach then gave the student a lecture on what it meant to be an athlete and how if one of the five cross country runners did not show up the meet woud be forfeited, as it already had been once that year, and sent the boy off with the order to "be there." The boy left, caught between his sick grandmother and his coach. The coach then talked about how hard it was to get the kids out, and how the attitude shown by that boy prevailed in the school. He spoke about the time when they tried to raise money for a boosters club for the school, went out and sold hot dogs and pop and candy at the games, and when "we had money, we wanted to have a dinner for the athletes at the end of the year. But so few people came it was embarrassing. OK, so you don't want to have a dinner, we'll have a trip to Cedar Point. So more preparation and only a few people came there. Then we tried a canoeing trip on the Au Sable, and there were more coaches and helpers than kids. Finally, I gave that stuff up, I don't know what they want." Reflecting on it he attributed it to the fact that "these are the less affluent kids, we can't get them away from working and into school sports."

This business of kids working and more interested in t t to support their car was widely cited in Utica. Indeed over two-thirds of the senior class left school after the fifth period to go to their jobs, and one-quarter of the junior class did the same. Teachers disparaged it and blamed it on two elements: the working class environment in the community, and the car that the student needed a job to sustain. "Hey they get a license and then they get a car and then the old lady looks at that

insurance check and says, 'I think it's time you got a job! Then work is the most important thing in their lives."

It was apparent in Pontiac, where the school day ended for everyone at 12:50 and, according to the staff there, the students did not have the opportunity for employment that the students in Utica had with strips of fast food and service stores, factories and garages in abundance. Hence there was much more opportunity for work there than in Pontiac.

Our point, which we did not adequately research, since our intent was to follow teachers, not students, is that not only do the teachers have their school lives compartmentalized and regard teaching as only one of many important things they do, but students too, with their cars, their jobs and their utilitarian approach to school were unwilling to enter into a normative community. Those that would were highly regarded, for an honors or advanced section was something that teachers worked for and when attained they protected it. But in many classes they faced students with an orderly and not unfriendly perspective, yet found students unwilling to make available the time and energy needed to make learning exciting. Teachers expressed it a number of ways. "They're blue collar," "they're working class," "they don't come from a place where learning is valued"... "their parents don't care, look how few show up for parents' night." (It was true; both schools had one evening a term where parents could come in and talk about the children's performance, and while both were adequately promoted, few parents showed up, "and the ones that do show up are not the ones you want to talk to anyway." "They're the parents of kids that are doing fine.") "We can't keep them interested." "They have to have everything explained in terms of what good it will do them on the job."

The lack of normativeness that we described among teachers also applied to students. They, too, compartmentalized school as only one, and perhaps not the most important, thing they do with their lives. This was possibly a main reason why so many teachers filled up their lives with other activities. It just did not pay; one did not get back, when he was putting out emotional energy to a reluctant and marginally interested clinentele.

SUMMARY TO PART II

In this section, we have tried to explain a seldom mentioned, but in our opinion, very real and important phenomenon in secondary schools. That is that for teachers, the school is only one of some, or even many, important and demanding elements in their lives. Hence the time and energy they have to devote to school was less than it might have been. Our second point, was that these outside activities were not done with one another as much as they were done alone, and hence not only complicated one's field, but further isolated that field from those of his colleagues. What all of that does is severely limit the amount of discretionary time available for school activities and limit the motivation to take what discretionary time there is and put it into school-related matters. Were one to suggest that teachers come together for examination of the curriculum or development of new courses or revision of some aspect of school, he would be asking people to give up time and energy that has already been allocated out to second jobs, families, hobbies or whatever. In this regard we were interested in observing in-service days. At Utica there were two, in both cases they involved a presentation to the faculty by some outsider and both times they were given only marginal attention,

evoked no general discussion, and were in fact widely disdained as a waste of time. In Utica one group of teachers sat in the back during these and would peel some numbers and bet on how long the presentation would last. If one had a certain number that might be short, he would ask a question to try to make the presentation approximate his number. That was a good indication of the interest in these in-service days. In Pontiac, the in-service days were by contract apportioned out as teacher work days, and when, on one of them, the principal held first a faculty meeting and then suggested department meetings, the latter was grieved because the teachers wanted and by contract deserved the time for their individual preparations. That, too, was a good indication of the response received by some modest requests for pooled faculty involvement in the school.

Again, our point is not that people did not work hard or teach well; our guess is that some did and some did not. We were not there to judge quality but to study the interactions that dominated the schools. Our assertion is that the interactions that counted most were the interaction of personal elements in the individual teacher's life. It was these private sets which dominated the school, not the general interactions of teacher and teachers.

A related point is that while it may be that the outside constraints in teachers' lives indicate something less than normative compliance, so iw was in those schools, one a "blue collar," the second an "inner city," that the majority of students did not enter normatively into some affective learning community, but themselves gave only utilitarian compliance. "Why do we have to study geometry?" "Why do we have to learn to write?" "What good is foreign language or physics?" These were often expressed and teachers responded in terms of a utilitarian and monetary reward somewhere

down the line for those who would avail themsleves. But, in truth, few students saw the value of abstract positive knowledge, and their jobs, cars, dates, sports and families were more important. While the rhetoric of teaching a classroom is often phrased in affective and normative terms, the fact is that for both teachers and students in secondary schools, there are innumerable elements competing for time and attention, and the structure is such that each is free to decide how he will allocate his time among competing elements.

Teachers and Teachers

The problem with this report is that we have not yet begun to describe what we initially said we would, that is, the interactions of teachers and teachers. But while our study is a network study, more than that it is a study of two secondary schools. Our major assertion has been that it is not the organizational or personal networks as much as it is the egocentric fields that dominate the school and that one has to study if he is to understand what happens in the schools. However, there are many aspects of the school in which people do interact regularly and we would like to begin disucssing them.

First, of course, is the departmental structure. Within that structure, people teach in proximity to one another, share the same departmental office, meet to decide on texts and other supplies, schedule classes or be scheduled into classes. If one wants to initiate some course, he usually has to go through a department chairman. Of course all of this lead to innumerable interactions and, for many, the department was the strongest source of personal ties in the school, but it had certain limits. The department chairman did not supervise or evaluate, nor did he have any business entering one's classroom uninvited. Other department members

behaved the same way. It would not do to comment on or criticize another's style or choice of material or challenge one's opinion on some matter. The departments, as such, served some important coordinating functions and socializing functions, but they did not pass beyond the corridors and the halls into the classrooms. A good example of this was the English curriculum in Utica. EPIC, The Elective Program in Communication, in Utica was a system-wide endeavor to coordinate Language Arts across the district's four secondary schools. The coordinating effort had been initiated by two secondary English teachers who wanted to see more system-wide emphasis on "basic skills," as well as a coordinated program. With the approval of the superintendent and the board of education, they called a meeting of all the secondary English teachers in the district, explained what they had in mind and began by asking those teachers to make public what they were doing in their classes by handing in their course outlines. But according to the former system-wide chairman..."They (the teachers) just sat there with their arms folded and said in effect, 'You can't make me do anything', and eventually the superintendent himself had to come in and tell them to hand in their outlines." "And did they do it then?" "No, not even then, they still sat there, but the truth, and we knew it, was that many of them didn't even have course outlines." Eventually the two originators of the idea found some people in each school who would help them develop and compile course outlines. In Utica, the past and present department chairman told the two originators that "Our people don't even have these things as we, Gail and I, did them all. We worked on them from 7 in the morning until 12 at night, and she was pregnant and sometimes she would have to leave, and I'd be there typing until midnight." Eventually they handed in all the English outlines

from all the courses taught in the school. Whether certain individuals in the other schools handed them in the same way, we do not know, but all the outlines were handed in and compiled and some explanation of the total English curriculum was given. Then a meeting of all the English teachers was held, and they approved the curriculum. Apparently what they approved system-wide, although there were varying versions of this, was a greater emphasis on basic skills with some systematic testing program. In Utica, the former chairman of the department had taken this very seriously, had written the grammer sections herself, had written the pre and post tests of usage that were supposed to be stressed in freshman and sophomore classes, had developed scoring sheets to accompany the tests, did the distributing of tests and scoring herself to make sure it was done, and had developed elaborate files which she kept locked in the department office. She had the active or at least passive cooperation of the whole department, but was herself doing what was supposed to be done in each of the other three schools. Even so, there were some sources of irritation among her and those in the English department at Utica who felt that they had followed through on the intent of the curriculum, to work on grammer and skills, while in two of the other district high schools, no similar effort was made. After compiling their curriculum, those in two other schools made no changes whatsoever. A second sore point, although we had to ask the question in order to elicit it, was that despite the considerable amount of time and effort that the chairman and some other members of the department had expended, no one, not the principal nor any assistant, nor the director of secondary education in the district, nor the superintendent, nor the board, nor anyone outside the department ever looked at the tests, commented on the system for testing

and record keeping, or even acknowledged the change. In fact, the director of secondary education did not even mention to the two other schools that they were in non-compliance with a district-wide decision. The third sore point, and this within the school and again not stated unless we asked, was that not all of the teachers in the school were teaching the grammar. As the present chairman who had inherited the system and the testing and scoring procedures explained, "The kids come to me and say 'Ms. so and so doesn't teach us the grammar' and I can go to that person and ask if she wants some help, but I could never go to the principal and report it. She (the teacher) would find out."

What we saw was the most extensive attempt to revise and coordinate curriculum that we could find in the school. In fact when we entered in order to "follow issues through the organization," this was one of the first that was suggested. But what it finally represented was the personal interest and energy of the two teachers in the other schools, both of whom are new administrators and the interest and energy of the past and present chairman of the department in Utica, one of whom is planning on a maternity leave. But no one who did not have a personal interest in the development and continuation of the program did anything to change his behavior. The superintendent frankly did not believe in hiring supervisors. He was proud of the fact that of 85 school districts in the Detroit Metropolitan area, his was the 83rd in terms of administrative costs. That was fine with him. "We hire good people and leave them alone and most teachers do a good job. It isn't worth the time and trouble to hire supervisors to watch the small number who aren't doing anything. The broad range in the middle, the sixty percent, they put out, they try hard, it isn't worth the effort to coordinate everyone to get at the few

who fail." The director of secondary curriculum, by his own admission had "spent the last twenty years hiring teachers and building buildings." In fact, he was at that time building a new junior high school, and he had neither the time nor the staff to "coordinate" this or that curriculum across four schools. While one might blame him for not recognizing the efforts of the teachers in Utica, or a few of the teachers in Utica, were he to do so, he might have to publically recognize it and he might then have to do something about those in other schools who were not following through. The principal, whom some blamed for his inattention to curriculum, followed the perspective of the district in leaving teachers alone, and the assistants were busy with attendance, discipline, special education and committees. The originators of the program were no longer teaching English, and the chairman of the department admitted that while some teachers did not follow the program, there was little she could do about it. While the department was composed of people who liked and supported each other, they admitted that it was the past chairman's energy and attention to detail that made the program work as well as it had. When she left, as she had done, the succeeding chairman was not as involved, and most expected the attention to detail to decrease. The other teachers in the school, save one typing and business practice teacher who complimented some English teachers because the student's skills had been increasing, paid no attention to the program.

It was similar to other efforts we observed. It went as far as one person's energy and enthusiasm could take it in a place where others, even those with ostensible authority over such matters, are not allowed to intrude into what or how one teaches in his class. With no institutionalized processes for systematic implimentation or evaluation, then the individual(s)

who wanted a change could create one and could even find some like-minded people to assist, but when her interest changed or enthusiasm faded or when the like-mindedness no longer held, then the program ceased.

That English department was composed of people who had good personal relations, who spoke warmly of one another. Many spent their off hours in the same office, but at a department meeting, they gave further evidence of this unwillingness to let one another effect their teaching. The issue was "possible changes in the EPIC curriculum," but the discussion was desultory at best. One woman had herself paged out by the office, one was reading, two were working on their class papers, one more, the former chairman, worked on her class papers but took a limited part, and the others entered and exited the discussion sporadically. On grammar, one said they should stress it; another commented that without writing, stressing grammar made no sense; another commented on sentence structure, saying it was overstressed; another disagreed. But no discussion followed any of these random comments, no conclusion was reached or made, and the meeting drifted off. A second decision they had to make that meeting concerned an outstanding student award, but again no decision was reached. As soon as one student was suggested, another would comment that the person had "taken the easy courses," or had "just chased grades" or had not been impressive in his or her class. No one seemed able to suggest a student that each could agree was outstanding, so the decision was made to not give the award out that year. It was another indication of the lack of concensus and even the lack of importance of concensus in the department.

There might have been a network in the department, but first let us describe the field of the members. One was a professional tennis player

and sports enthusiast, who spent time in sports with some other teachers, and had her main teaching interest in drama. Another sponsored the yearbook and spent her free time in her office doing that. She, with some women in the home economics room, responded to another teacher's call for a non-smokers lunch. One was head of the union, spent his time and energy there and socialized with some people who hung out in the industrial arts area. The past chairman, had a successful husband and was involved in family matters. Another had her newspaper; another the present chairman, her debate club; another his honors classes, his friends and said frankly that he was not about to put more energy into the department. One other gentleman was quiet and scholarly, and there was a part-time reading teacher whom we did not see. Each person had his own classes, his project in or out of school, his own distinct set of friends, and none, as far as we could see, was about to have this disturbed by some departmental matter, particularly since the deparment did not offer anything in return. With few exceptions departmental decisions followed the individual. There was K____s paper, G____s yearbook, G___s chairmanship, J___s honors English, L___s Shakespeare, M___s debate. If two wanted to do the work associated with coordinating the basic skills testing, fine. If not that would be the end of it. There was an exception. At one time a woman had wanted an honor's 9th grade, had gone to the principal and gotten it tentatively approved but according to another, "She couldn't do that, it would foul up all our ninth grade efforts, so we went to the principal and stopped it." There was a limit to what one could do and in that case it was expressed by the department. There was some collective power, and, on occasion, when one person's ambition threatened others, they expressed it as a unit.

But still, if we were to draw out the departmental network, it would consist of a set of circles, each one representing a field, and each one touching the departmental circle but rarely overlapping one another. Individuals would converse with another who shared that period and were willing, but these interactions were neither long-lasting, because of the schedule changes from term to term, nor compelling, because one's work did not impinge on another.

In the social studies department it was not much different, except for three people who wanted it that way. These were three fairly new teachers who shared materials, shared ideas for their classes, shared after hours social events, shared a high level of interest in activities. One coached cheerleaders, another pom pom girls, another sponsored an actvities assembly to raise money for a stricken student. As teachers who actively pursued their own interests, one had started a course in international relations, another some courses in sociology, another a course in psychology, each developing his class, recruiting his students and taking it through the channels. They uniformly condemned the department chairman for "doing nothing but showing movies...and we had one department meeting all year," but that did not stop them from doing what they wanted. They did not need the department to develop their own classes. While these people, two in particular, were fast friends, and shared many activities in and out of the school, when we asked what they did together as teachers, the answer was nothing. As one put it, "R___ is my best friend, we're together all the time, but he has never been in my class or invited me into his. I wish he would but he hasn't."

But while they did not extend their friendships into their own classrooms, they did hold extended conversations about their teaching, their out- of-school activities, their educational philosophies and

and ambitions. When one sponsored a student activity, the others supported him. All started classes and actively recruited their own students for these classes. When the department chairman and some other members of the department appeared not to support their efforts to increase electives, they simply went around him and had their courses approved by the principal. When their efforts at recruiting students for their advanced classes resulted in one member of the department being stuck with five classes of 9th grade civics, then that was too bad. That person could and did rail against the system which apportioned classes unfairly, but he had done nothing to protect himself.

The fact is that department membership meant something only on occasions when one would find it convenient to use the department to further his personal ends. When a teacher whom the advanced biology teacher did not like, was assigned to teach elementary biology, the advanced teacher went to the principal and argued that the department did not want that individual. But when in that same department, the chairman wanted some cooperation for a departmental inservice, that same advanced biology teacher refused to cooperate, refused to attend the agreed upon activity and even took two other science teachers away with him for the day. When he wanted to use the department to protect his biology, he used it. When it was inconvenient, he ignored it with impunity. When the coaches wanted increased supplies, they went to the department chairman and argued as a department; when there was an attempt to get them to participate in a departmental inservice designed to add some skills to their repertoire, they stayed in their men coaches' locker room all morning. The weakness of departments was indicative of the weakness of the chairman's position. The chairman of the science department said she

would never again attempt to coordinate an inservice. The former chairman of the business department said she could not do anything about the behavior of some teachers..."I tried to get them to come to class on time and not drink coffee in class, but it didn't do any good." The social studies department, while somewhat resentful of the efforts of the three younger teachers, said that he knew that one of them wanted to be chairman and "When he gets it and he wants something from me, then it's, Hey ____ you baby." In fact one auto mechanics teacher who had been a department chairman was removed by the principal from the position for "causing too much trouble. He'd go right into their classes and check their record books."

On the other hand there were times as we explained that individual gestures were expressed in the structure of the departments. When the head of the math department was having some trouble with the schedule, he gave up his free period to take a geometry class because he saw that one of the math teachers would have 40 in the class. "I couldn't let one of my teachers take a class of 40." When the industrial arts department, which prided itself on good student behavior in that area had a new teacher who was "having trouble with discipline", in the name of the department they went to the principal and asked him to help that individual. When it was in the interest of an individual or a group to exert some influence, and the department was a convenient way to do so they did it. But the department, per se, was not the vehicle to understand what went on among the teachers in Utica High School. Nor in Pontiac High School, which we did not mention in this context, but in which the same behaviors held but even more so because of the isolation of each teacher in his or her own room for the entire time the students were present.

There was not the opportunity for informal interaction that took place in Utica because the department offices did not serve as quick stops during a free period (there were no free periods), lunch places or informal gathering places after students had gone.

But if it was not the departments, then we have to return again to the concept of field. As we stated, there were purposive interactions all over those schools between teacher and teacher, and our assertion is that these purposive interactions were intended to extend and protect the field of each individual, but, at the same time, were not allowed to intrude into his or her classroom. Let us explain. When talking about teacher and teacher, we have to sift through innumerable interactions and try to winnow out those that seem to have something to do with the school as an educational organization. We discarded the pleasantries, the tales, the gossip, the casual greetings , and conversations and tried to observe and record those interactions that were stable and enduring, assuming that their stability and endurance was evidence that they serve some purpose. Our argument is that the individual teachers maintained autonomy in their interactions with students, that their teaching style and choice of content stemmed from the field composed of factors in their backgrounds. Extending this idea, the interactions between teacher and teacher were designed to extend and sustain that individual field.

Our model is composed first of a background field from which stems one's approach to the task of instructing students; a second field composed of the teacher and some students, for whom that teacher's approach is considered to be "good"; and finally, a third field, or network, composed of the teacher and his colleagues, which one enters into in order to create, extend or protect the initial field. There are two

types of this third entity. The first is composed of those interactions which represent an undisguised attempt by a person to build a support system for his activity. The second consists of informal interactions in which teachers take genuine pleasure in one another's company and, over the course of their interactions, these informal associations themselves become an important part of one's field. As an example of the former type we might cite the newspaper sponsor whom we discussed before and described as being independent of her colleagues. She purposively cultivated the principal and the activities director, an individual in the central office who had access to some copy machines, and another teacher who helped her students with camera work, all of whom she needed in order to sustain her newspaper. For an example of the second type, we could cite a group of males, including two teachers, one guidance counselor and the athletic director who went out to lunch every single day and had been doing so for years. That lunch and the friendship and comradeship that went with it were important elements in their professional lives and actually the reason that two of them had even stayed working in that school. For the former, we can indicate the yearbook sponsor, who cultivated the principal, cultivated the activities director, and a vice president for her support in a dispute over a choice of photographers, and built her own network to support her yearbook. For the latter, we may indicate the group of men in the "pit", (a dingy office adjacent to the industrial arts area), who liked each other, who in the fashion of long time comradely associates discussed one anothers personal lives, finances, and lunches, who drank together on Friday and fished and hunted together, who helped one another build a house or garage or pour cement or finish basements, for whom regular association,

every fifth hour every day, every morning before school, and every Friday evening, was important to having a satisfactory life in that school.

This same group in the industrial arts area was composed half of teachers from the industrial arts department and half from other areas. In an incident we mentioned earlier these industrial arts teachers had gone to the principal to ask him to help a teacher who was having trouble with discipline. But according to that teacher, discipline was not the issue at all. The issue was that he did not join in that group in the "pit," did not like to go to saloons on Friday evening and was resisting the pressure to join. Which side is true is not important, for there is probably some truth in both sides, but, for the individuals in this group, that collegial set was an important part of their lives in that place and they took concerted action to protect it. In this explanation we have not yet moved beyond the idea of egocentric circles, but there are individuals who have not one set of support colleguas but many, and subsequently many sets because their in-school field is more active and complex. T___sponsors an activity so he associates with the activities director, keeps score at basketball games so he associates with the athletic director and coaches, initiated a new class so he seeks out the principal, socializes with other teachers so he attends the Friday sessions in the bar with like minded teachers and in addition he was brought up and lives in the community. Because of his involvement, he is sought out in turn by the activities director for assistance on another activity, by the principal to serve on a committee, by the athletic director for extra work if he wants it. He has not one collegue or set of collegues but many sets all over the school. His is a complex

social environment. But the teacher who was hired to teach one class of physical science and some 9th grade general science, but decided that he preferred physical science and through working on the class, recruiting more students, and garnering the support of the principal, now has one class of chemistry and four of physical science. But he has no friends in the school, is on no committees, and attends no more than the two evening activities a year demanded by the contract. For him the school is considerably less complex. But the principle holds. Both teachers moved into the social life of the school in order to enhance their fields.

According to the activities director who watched such things, there were only ten or twelve teachers in the school who behaved as did T____ sponsoring activities, initiating new classes, joining in whenever asked, and giving what theorists call normative compliance. When we asked these teachers why they did it, the response was always phrased in terms of "liking" kids, "looking for other ways to relate to students," "being unmarried and therefore having more time than other teachers," "wanting to make the school a more total environment." All these internal groups and associations were individually created for personal reasons, yet they were not structurally maintained or structurally rewarded. Membership in any one was open and voluntary. One could as well join in the 4th and 5th hour euchre club in the lunch room, as he could the group in the pit, the teachers in the non-smoking lunch session 6th period, the special ed teachers, the group in the bar on Friday afternoon, or one could, even were he not a coach, make the coaches' locker room his hangout if he liked and wanted to talk sports. All of the associations were fluid and non-exclusive, open to any one who availed himself, wanted to join and would take part regularly. If one chose not to join this or that

one, or none at all, there was no sanction, no gossip about him, nor was he regarded as an outcast. All these associations, the ones that were purposively directed to gain some support and resources and the ones that were designed to help one fill out his life in that school in a way that he chose, were personally and individually initiated and sustained. Some of these associations were stable and long standing in the way of habits and old friendships, but not in an institutionally sustained way. Those designed for curricular ends and those designed for non-curricular ends shared the common genesis, someone cared to put the effort in and engaged in the activity. If he or they stopped, it stopped. And they did not cross over into one another. It was never the case that membership in one of these entities effected membership in another. An individual may be a member of a department, a lunch or card group and a coach of some sport, but none of what he does in one related to or effected what he did in another. None of the units were allowed to enter in to and disturb a member's or a non-member's autonomy in his classes. Even in that one case where members of the "pit" group went to the principal and tried to pressure one industrial arts teacher to join them, he simply refused and they could do nothing.

The school then was composed of a serialized and segmented set of interactions, individually and purposefully initiated and maintained to fulfill some personal need, either to extend one's teaching style or provide a fuller life. These associations were accessible to all, but membership in one did not preclude or effect membership in another, nor were they allowed to intrude into one's own way of dealing with students and teaching. In fact, in none of those informal sets was there ever any generalized discussion of or search for consensus on the best way to deal with students.

Now whether this constitutes a network, per se, is questionable. A network implies a certain amount of cross-membership with associations of one kind implying associations of a second kind. But we did not find that. What characterized the associations, both those that were purposively designed to extend one's field, or those that were designed to fill out one's personal life, were all isolated from each other. One might be a member of two or more, but there was no overall pattern to help one predict from knowing membership in some groups to predicting membership in other groups. For that reason, we say that just as the teachers maintained their personal autonomy in dealing with students, these groups did not serve secondary purposes; that is, they did not have implications for school-wide issues because school-wide issues did not get processed through them. They were all tightly-bounded, single purpose entities.

For the principal however, the dynamics of the schools were not so simple. He controlled the schedule and additional resources, and had to use those in order to encourage what he wanted. At lunch one day with a group, the conversation turned to duties and the assertion was made that "The principal can screw you." "How could that possibly be?" We asked, "You're tenured, certified, you're discipline is good, the salary schedule is uniform, there is no merit pay, the contract sets out class and student loads, how can the principal screw you?" But as it was explained, we were eating out, an activity that required a double lunch hour, and he could take that away by a schedule decision. And for those people who enjoyed eating out every day, and for whom that eating out was important, he had considerable power. For the principal, the school was composed of a series of sets of interactions, but for him they were not unrelated. The group who wanted the double lunch cultivated him to

maintain it. He let them keep it, but he knew that he could call on them, if he needed some assistance with an activity or some unusual event. But he did have to fill a certain number of classes during fourth and fifth hour, so that meant some other people in those departments had to teach when they might have preferred to be eating. The coaches wanted the 8th period free to prepare for their after school events, others would want to avoid cafeteria duty, others would want extra funds or an additional class, a department chairmanship or a free first hour to conduct business. The power of the principal stemmed from his control over the schedule and those other resources that individuals wanted in order to further their own ends. To the degree that he could, he entered into a quid pre quo relationship with one individual, awarding him or her a department chairmanship, another some extra funds, or a free eighth hour, a co-op position, or a coaching job. What he wanted in return, particularly in Utica where funds were more available, was the willing compliance and cooperation of those people for activities and events. He wanted people to enter into the spirit of the place. He wanted or said he wanted more of a community in the school and what he had to encourage it was a positive response to those who behaved in what he considered a communal and cooperative way. While accused of playing favorites, in truth, given the limits of dealing with a tenured, contracted, mature faculty, many of whom expended more energy on outside activities than they did in school, he really did not have very much in the way of power or rewards to dispense. He could neither hire nor fire, promote nor demote, pay more nor less, give fewer nor more than the contractually agreed upon number of classes. What he could do is support their private versions of the job, and he did it in exchange for cooperation. We

could understand the criticism from those who said he "played favorites," but as he saw it, he was using what little he had to create a unit from a set of disparate entities.

From his position, and from that of the athletic director who was involved in a number of activities and controlled some resources, and to some extent for the activities director, the word "network" meant something. They were involved in activities and what occured in one would effect what occured in another. But for the others on the staff, there remained their private fields, and what forays they made into the social interaction of the school did not go beyond their individual interests. This goes back to a point we made earlier about the intent of the study being to follow issues as they wended their way through the faculty, but finding after we were in the schools, that issues did not do that. They did not go beyond individual interests.

It was interesting to speculate that if one were willing to do just as the contract stated, and wanted no extra funds or the better classes or any favored schedule or free first or eighth hour, if one were content with fifth period cafeteria duty and five classes of 9th grade general math or civics, neither the principal nor anyone else could have any power relative to him. But if one wanted more than that and everyone whom we met did, then he or she had to enter into the general social arena of the school and cultivate what relationships were necessary in order to get what he or she wanted.

This was less true in Pontiac with its straight five period day and a lack of funds which denied many of the extra activities, sports, clubs, trips, where there were few opportunties for carving out a favored position. But there in particular there was a great deal of talk

about "the old days" in the "old school" when people supported each other, when they attended events together and went beer drinking afterwards, when they ate and socialized together and knew each other's children. There were still strong old friendships, hunting and fishing expeditions, a year end corn party at one person's farm, but because of the severe nature of the finances, there were fewer opportunities in the school. People there were even more likely, when they finished talking about the "old days in the old school," to leave by themselves for their distant home, their families, and whatever other activities they maintained outside.

We were curious about the rewards for entrance into the general social arena, and frequently asked people why they did things, why they sponsored activities or attended evening events or started clubs. The answer always reinforced our assertion that the interactions really were an individual and not a structural matter, because the only rewards for "doing things" were the personal rewards such as satisfaction, comraderie or self-justification or a good relationship with kids. The people who expressed unhappiness with the reward structure would speak of the principal not attending their event or recognizing their effort or the superintendent or other teachers not giving them praise and recognition for what one did. But what we saw was that since none of these activities were institutionalized, what one got from any of them, he or she had to generate himself. If that was not enough, in many cases it was not, then he would stop, and the activity would cease.

Summary

In this section, we have followed our initial assertion, that the important networks in the school are not the network of teacher and teacher,

but the intrapersonal fields or set of constraints which bind one's life and upon which his approach to teaching is predicated. Extended out into the social arena of the school, it seemed to us that what characterized those interactions was that their genesis and sustinence was individual and not structural. Within the schools there was little supervision over individual teacher behavior and a corresponding lack of control over the curriculum. There was also some room, particularly in Utica, for one, within certain limits, to exercise some individual initiative in creating a satisfactory life for himself. He could seek to teach the better classes; could find a class schedule that suited him and perhaps his outside job; could find a rewarding activity to engage in and could form some good relationships with students in that activity; could find a second job in the school, a chairmanship coaching or sports-related job; or could find some people whom he liked to socialize with outside school. Within the general constraints of teaching five classes of adolescents, these variations on the theme were all possible. One cultivated those whom he needed for whatever his personal reasons, to support his favored activity.

In Pontiac there were fewer interactions between teacher and teacher and while people suggested that it was the fault of the building which was admittedly vast and cold, we suggest that the fiscal constraints on the district were such that there was little to entice one out of his own field. There were long friendships there, but the extras had all been cut out and therefore there were few rewards. Also there were fewer, at least according to the teachers, of the kind of students that teachers really wanted to teach so one did not even try to attain those favored classes. Also, and we are reluctant to say this, there was no one in the

school who had fewer than 13 years experience, and by that time, one had his routine and simply was not available for experimentation. In that case, while there were the social interactions of people who ate together every day, there was much less of the cultivating of people who could help with a favored project, and subsequently much less interaction among the faculty.

We stressed the lack of structural support for any of these interactions which is important to us. It is important because as we explain it, the curriculum of the school is structured by the teachers and, in fact, can be said to follow the individual teacher's predilections. Since those predilections are brought into the school individually, it seems to us that the curriculum of the school is doubly unstructured.

The second point we want to stress in this section is the isolation of one group from another. Our suggestion is that this explains and is explained by the individual nature of each element and the fact that all these teachers had a strong self-idea of what it meant to teach kids and what was good for kids and did not allow membership in these units to effect that concept. Of course, for those individuals who control some resources and who, by the nature of their job, were automatically important to a number of other people, the school did resemble a network. The essense of the principal's power in that place was dependent on his ability to satisfy many requests with very limited resources, and he was judged on whether his decisions regarding these units made any overall sense. His interest in encouraging some cooperation among people was reasonable. He saw, as did anyone who considered it, that the concept of "school" was weak indeed. With all the individualism and utilitarian compliance and divergent thinking about what was "good

for kids," there really was not much left of an organizational ethic. What he tried to do was use what little he had at his disposal to encourage some of that school feeling.

CHAPTER III

Conclusions

The purpose of our study was to describe and explain the networks among professional staffs of two secondary schools. A network may be defined as a social field composed of a set of individuals and the totality of relationships that joins them into some unit. For this study the set of individuals was the staffs of the two schools, the relationships were all those human ties that they carried into the schools and which effected their lives as teachers. The popularity of the concept can be attributed to its usefulness in describing relationships in an open society with a mobile population consisting of individuals whose lives are filled with compartmentalized roles. One's family or kin role may be quite distinct from his work role, from his recreational role, comm ity role and so on. While people still maintain the basic ties of kin, group, friendship, collegiality and class, these traditional concepts do not suffice to explain relationships in a given setting. Each setting, according to its institutional constraints, is likely to encourage the development of certain types of networks. One studies then not only the relationships but more importantly the totality of those networks as they constitute the institution.

For purposes of this study, we found it convenient to divide the concept. For the first part of this subdivision, we used the term "field" indicating the network from the vantage point of a person or group consisting of all the units with which that person or group maintains a certain type of relation. We found this convenient because our data consistently indicated individual teachers developed their approach to teaching and

and curriculum, not on the position relative to colleagues within or without the school, but upon their own predilections, constraints, family, second job or avocation and perspective. The term "field" gives us a way to talk of curriculum construction in the school. The second category, which is also the more common usage of the term network denotes the totality of all the units connected by a certain type of relation. That usage serves to generalize about the internal structure of the institution. It serves to assist one in answering the question, "What general statement may we make concerning all of the interactions of all of the individuals in that place?"

The study was undertaken with field methods in two secondary schools in the metropolitan Detroit area. Both schools could be called comprehensive schools, one serving a 2100 urban, biracial population, the second serving 1500 white students. Both contained students from all economic classes, although both might be categorized as "working class" or blue collar schools. Each offered a full range of courses, business, industrial arts and each was characterized by specialization of subjects and teachers, an emphasis on scheduling and routine and batch processing of students. Some of the more subtle characteristics were the strong emphasis on doing what was "good for kids," but an absence of consensus on what "good for" might mean, a lack of surveillance over teachers and classes which left teachers to their own devices on how best to serve their charges, and an emphasis on an elective system which allowed students to make important decisions about their education by themselves. The school is also characterized by a strong internalized egalitarianism with a broad freedom of choice for both teachers and students; for the former as to how to conduct themselves relative to students,

for the latter as to what constituted an education. In fact, there is a great deal more individual freedom relative to curriculum than we envisioned when we entered the two schools. It was the extensive individualism among the staff with its absence of any sense of "we-ness" that encourages us to dichotomize "network" into two distinct terms, one with an egocentric emphasis and the second denoting some general pattern of interactions.

Our initial intent was to enter the two schools in the role of participant observer and after identifying some issues of current importance to the staff, follow those issues as they wended their way through the system. Our thinking was that such a method would presently reveal who talked to whom, whose opinion was solicited, who was elected to articulate various opinions or consensus, and who most influenced the outcome of any particular event. We further reasoned that we would be able to describe an event at its genesis and at successive stages of its wending its way through the faculty as well as its outcome. However after entering the schools, we concluded that issues did not wend their way through the staffs as we had envisioned. A given issue was important to a person or perhaps two people or even three, but no issue was of general concern to any significant portion of the faculty. In fact, here is where the dichotomy of network and field emerged and through which issues were processed. Subsequently, it was upon these fields that we focused in order to understand the events in those schools.

Our explanatory model was divided into three parts. We reasoned that one's approach to curriculum and to the generalized demands of teaching depended not so much on his subject, colleagues or traditional ethos of the institution but upon one's predelictions, background, educational perspective, outside constraints, etc. What we found was a

large group of individuals, who while appearing under the general rubric of "teachers in such and such a system" were in fact severely differentiated in their approach to students by their subjects, by their outside constraints and second jobs and distant homes and amount of time and effort they were willing to give the schools.

They had a great deal of freedom which stemmed from (1) lack of internal supervision, (2) institutional neglect of any generalized conception of what constituted an education or how best to approach children, (3) isolation from colleagues and the structural demand that one spend his days in the company of students who outnumbered him by some large number to one, and (4) a contract that demanded they attend to school matters for seven hours a day, 180 days a year. Many worked more hours, but one did not have to and many worked fewer. The fact is, as far as we could see, one is hired into the places, given an assignment demanding that he or she teach five classes, perhaps assume some other duties and then is left pretty much alone as long as he or she "gets along with kids." The schools are well able to handle ambiguity about what constitutes "getting along with kids." But with their popularized curricula and their dependence on the good will of the community for their financial survival, they cannot handle the strife that accompanies not "getting along with kids." If one saw this lack of consensus on what constitutes an education as a problem, he might suggest increased surveillance as a solution. But such a solution, demanding increased numbers of supervisors would be doubly dysfunctional. Not only would it cost additional money in communities which are wary of increased taxes, but it might lead to enforcing rules which antagonize students and subsequently leads to not "getting along with kids."

The lack of surveillance and the laissez faire attitude toward supervision was doubly functional.

In fact, within that ostensibly fairly structured environment, teachers did do quite different things. In the one school, Utica High, where there were opportunities and additional resources, a teacher could identify some specific activity such as a yearbook or a newspaper, a coaching or athletics related job, a department chairmanship or some favored classes, a club or activity, a schedule that accommodated other demands such as outside employment and for those who so choose, a set of informal relationships and long standing camaraderie was available. One was free, given his constraints of background, predilections, perspective and personality to carve out some segment of the school which interested him or take on some extant program which he wanted and make that the center of his professional life. Our contention was that the curriculum of the school was determined by these individuals and their egocentric fields.

A curriculum is not standard then in any sense of the term. It consists of all the innovations that have been interjected into the school over a period of years and changes according to the interest of the teachers. It is not an abstracted and agreed upon entity. One has an idea that she wants to teach international relations, philosophy, ballet, modern dance, gymnastics or soccer or Shakespeare. It is her ideas and energy that draw out the outline, recruit the students and work it into the curriculum, coopting the principal and whoever else is needed for support. In an elective system there is a great deal of room for this kind of action and teachers started courses this way. The curriculum demanded English. The teachers created music as expression,

speech, forensics, mystery stories, learning center, career, mythology, "trouble-shooter," (sic) grammar, journalism and yearbook in response to that demand for one unit in English.

One of the problems of the study was that we can only make rough guesses at the exact composition of any one teacher's field. We were acquainted with a number of individuals, many of whom had extra jobs, families with working spouses, serious avocations, diverse backgrounds, distant homes and differing perspectives on education. But as the focus of the study was on the school as a unit and the faculty as a collectivity, we did not feel free to select out one or two, any more would have been impossible, and ferret into their lives trying to discern the reasons for their approach to education. Frankly we did not feel that was a useful approach. For one reason, they were too diverse to trace, for another, even if we isolated all the important elements, we could only guess at the effect of any one on the teaching style and we were unwilling to engage in speculative psychology.

The first part of our model was the intrapersonal field of each teacher. The second part consists of the teacher and some students. It became immediately apparent that while teachers differed in their opinions as to what might be "good for kids," the "kids" they had in mind were not abstract or hypothetical kids, but real students whom they had contacted in the past or were presently teaching and for whom their particular approach was productive. Each could point to his or her success stories, those who succeeded in the professions or crafts, or who were responsible people in the community or who loved learning the way they loved it or who joined in an affective relation with them. Few teachers disparaged students, but they selected for praise those for whom their

particular style worked or was still working. What this second part of the model served to do was to justify the particular teacher's approach, so it meshed with the first part. There is nothing to prevent one from considering the referent students as a part of the teacher's intrapersonal field, but we are trying to characterize and divide our model according to type of relationship. It seems to us that the type of relationship that one held among the elements of his or her intrapersonal field differ from the type of relationships that one has with his students.

The third part of the model consists of the relations of teachers with other professionals in the school or in the district. According to the model, there are two types of relationships here. There are those friendships and personal relations of long standing of which one may avail himself to make his or her life in those places more rewarding. Frequently these become an important part of one's field. Secondly, one may also maintain ties with certain individuals in the school such as the principal, the guidance counselor, athletic or activities director for purposes of garnering support for his pattern of accommodation to the job. Should one, for his own reasons, wish to coach a sport or sponsor a club, develop an honors class or change a text, there are people whom he needs and whom he must cultivate in order to extend or at least protect the pattern he has or wishes to develop.

This puts those with control over some resources in the center of many competing fields. First of these is the principal with his control of the schedule, the guidance counselors who can make certain students available, the directors of athletics or activities who control extra

jobs and some limited funds. All of them are in formal positions where their help is solicited by teachers wishing to extend or protect their pattern. From their point of view, touching as they do a host of individual patterns, the school extends out as a network. But the constraints on the environment are such that none of these people has very much personal discretion, not even the principal. He is bound in by having to offer a given set of courses to a fixed number of students, and of course following the students, he has only a given number of teachers assigned to the tasks. The teachers of course are under a fixed contract which specifies their hours, department, extra duties, salary, teaching periods and so on. And, in addition, he is bound in by the primary responsibility of any building administrator, that he take what discretionary resources there are in the school and use them to maintain decent attendance, discipline and a general air of orderly discourse. All of this severly limits his ability to control or affect what goes on in the school, and that is why as an "educational leader" he is forced to rely on a quid pro quo relations with teachers, allowing them to extend or protect their set if they will help him by entering normatively into the life of the school. But in this, of course, he is primarily dependent on their own desires to take their time and energy and put them into their teaching. As we indicated, it is easily possible for them to put them into other areas of their lives. All of this means, again, that the dominant force in the school is the individual sets held by each teacher. It is their own fields that controls the educational processes in those schools.

Implications:

The implications of this study will be briefly and simply stated. It is not necessary to dwell on them at length; after all the researcher's primary job is to do what he said, in this case decribe and explain the networks in those schools and not to write a speculative essay. That task has been completed and any interested person is free now to take this public document and infer what he wishes from the presentation. However, to satisfy ourselves, there are some points we would like to make.

First of all we intend no criticism of those two schools. If there is any criticism of them, it will be a generalized one which may be extended to public secondary schools, not just to these two places. For purposes of this theory-generating study, where our sampling procedures were not random but rather were theoretical, we feel free to abide with the general sociological rule that the human behaviors exhibited in one type of setting, will hold as well in similar settings. The schools chosen are fragmented, they serve large numbers of students for fixed sessions on appointed days, and their physical and organizational structure is similar to a degree where no one who walked in either of them could possibly mistake the setting for what it is, a late 20th century American secondary school. As such we felt that it is permissable to suggest that what held in these two places will hold for other secondary schools.

There are a few specific implications we would draw from the study. The first is that given this study it is hard to understand why the critics of public education insist that secondary schools are "monolithic and sterile" and why they are continually trying to get schools

to give up more control of students. In Utica there were 168 separate courses, in Pontiac, 250. Both schools offered credit for independent study, special education, work study or co-op education. In Utica two-thirds of the seniors and one-third of the juniors left school as early as 10:45 to go to their jobs and in Pontiac the whole student body was released at 12:50. Given this wide choice of offerings, the few required hours of attendance, the emphasis on individual needs of students and the allowance for great diversity among approaches by the staff, we fail to understand how anyone could say schools are either monolithic or sterile save in a certain drabness of architecture. It appears to us that the educators who are being urged to give up an alledgedly heavy handed and unimaginative approach to their charges, have in fact already given up any pretext to knowing what constitutes an education and have provided as many diverse experiences as can be accommodated in a five or six hour day, turning over to families, work places and students themselves a great deal of responsibility for education. They have gone as far as it is feasible to allow the "individual" teacher or individual student to define education according to his predilections or needs. In fact it appears to us that schools have specialized, professionalized and individualized to excess and perhaps it would be wise to examine the effects of all this.

In that generalized sense, what we studied was institutions that in our opinion have given up and are continuing to give up any sense of moral authority over their students and over their students' education. The emphasis on individual teacher styles, the elective system which allows, even forces, adolescents to make the serious choices about their education by themselves, the paucity of standard

requirements and the numerous ways that even those few are kept unstandard, the absence of any overt administrative supervision, and the even greater absence of any sense of responsibility for colleagues' behavior, the stream of people from the central office or the intermediate district seeking out this or that student for particular treatment, the attention to students' rights and the following of quasi-legalistic procedures for solving disputes, all of this bespeaks an institution in which the collective moral authority is weak and is getting weaker, and the only source of educational strength left is with individual teachers following their own predilections and developing their own ways to justify their diverse behaviors.

Whether this is what was intended by the reforms such as the consolidation, increased size, comprehensiveness, specialization, and fragmentation, is hard to say. But in retrospect, the reforms of secondary education stemming ideologically from the belief that education is a child-centered, individualized entity have resulted in the institution giving up its moral authority over educational processes.

We might juxtapose this to Durkheim's view of moral education:

> For him education is above all a social means to a social end--the means by which a society guarantees its own survival. The teacher is society's agent, the critical link in cultural transmission. It is his task to create a social or moral vein. Through the teacher, society creates man in its image. That, says Durkheim, is the task the glory of education. It is not merely a matter of allowing an individual to develop in accordance with his nature, disclosing whatever hidden capacities lie there only waiting to be revealed. Education creates a new being. (Durkheims' Moral Education, p. xi to xii.)

Durkheim's point is that a great deal of what one learns in school is bound up with the structure of the institution. In an institution that consistently devalues any collective moral authority in favor of

"individualized" rights and choices, one learns that his own egocentricism is more important than a collective, and his own needs more important than society's.

Related to this there are some points of note. One phenomenon we glimpsed, but did not follow was that many public school teachers whom we contacted did not send their children to the school where they worked, not because they worked there, but because they preferred private schools. When they were asked why, they spoke in vague terms about order, discipline, or expectations, but what we inferred and what they agreed with, was that they were going to some considerable expense to expose their child to an abstracted but universalistic authority exercised by the private school. That is particularly interesting because in public schools we speak of increased electives, per pupil expenditures, teacher pupil ratio and adequate facilities. The private schools, while inferior on each of those points to their public counterparts, have maintained some collective moral authority and as a result are attracting an increasing number of students.

A well researched piece of evidence is the book 15,000 Hours indicating that in schools where teachers accepted responsibility for one another's behavior, where the senior staff supervised the junior staff, where expectations for homework were enforced by the whole staff, where teachers expected one another to spend their time instructing and engaging in joint planning and set common criteria for students' deportment and enforced it consistently, in those schools students achieved better on all measures. Students were less likely to turn to juvenile delinquency, had greater academic success, and better attendance. It may be that in our haste to be responsive to "every

child's individual needs" we have given away the very element that makes a school worth attending, that sense of being engaged in a common endeavor with likeminded and supportive people. That in itself according to Durkheim is the essence of schooling.

Regarding this business of student achievement, it seems that it is hard to justify a demanding curriculum in the schools we described. It is hard to convince students to take algebra, trigonometry, advanced foreign language or literature when one has to phrase his argument in utilitarian terms, and admit it is the student's choice to elect an easier route. It is not immediately apparent to adolescents that such courses are "good" for them and so they do elect the easier route. Yet students of equal ability take and pass harder courses all the time because they find themselves faced with institutional norms that tell them "this is the way we behave here." Not only may schools that are so fragmented and specialized teach excessive individualism at the expense of community or society, but they simply cannot justify a harder curriculum with an ideology based on utilitarian individualism.

In that regard, one of the problems we have is that with our history of emphasizing the individual and further fragmenting the institution we no longer have even a language that allows us to talk about schools in other than fragmented terms. When one talks about schools in terms of moral authority, or collective discipline, he opens himself to the charge of facism, racism, or ignorance of individual differences. It is acceptable to discuss schools in terms of specialized institutions serving unique individuals. It is not acceptable to discuss schools as bastions of collective moral authority within which orderly discourse, orderly behavior and an internalized code of social responsibility

should be learned. Schools which themselves model the demeaning of collective moral authority teach students to demean collective moral authority.

There is a great deal of talk these days in educational research circles about "the principal making the difference" and the search is out for dynamic, talented and exceptional individuals who will make up for the lack of togetherness within institutions. While we believe there may be such superior individuals, we also believe it makes little sense to ask an individual to make up for what a whole organization is geared to discount. If there is to be some resurgence of moral authority in secondary schools, then one person cannot be expected to carry it all. It will have to be internalized, shared by all the participants and legitimized by collective approval. It cannot rest on one person to make up for by dint of personality what an institution lacks. And particularly in a school that emphasizes individual rights and perogatives. an administrator has to spend his time guarding himself against violating or being party to violations of human rights. One cannot expect a principal to be able to stand outside the major thrust of the institution and hold up an opposite ideal. He or she too is bound by what everyone else there is bound by, a set of collective understandings and if the understandings are that the individual takes precedence over the collective, then he or she too is bound by that understanding.

Finally, while we have been drawing upon implications that suggest schools are less than they could be, it may be that the way these schools are presently operating is fine. While perhaps uneven in their quality, the process of allowing teachers and students freedom to find their own styles and their own education is just what should be. However, in our

opinion that would make sense only if there were normative compliance to the task among all inhabitants. But our opinion is that this is not the case. One's own motivation is simply not sufficient to warrant the effort to work hard at learning or in many cases at teaching. Schools need some greater generalized sense of appropriate behavior if they are to stimulate either teachers or students.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Conceptual Framework

The methodology used in any research must be intrinsically related to the basic assumptions about the phenomena to be studied. Accordingly, an explanation of the methodology used in this work should begin with a brief discussion of the theory of symbolic interaction:

> The term "symbolic interaction" refers, of course to the particular and distinctive character of interaction as it takes place between human beings. The pecularity consists in the fact that human beings interpret or "define" each other's actions. Their response is not on the meaning which they attach to such actions. Thus human interaction is mediated by the use of symbols, by interpretation or by ascertaining the meaning of one another's actions.[61]

An individual, then, is conceived of as as acting unit engaged in the longitudinal process of constructing his action through constant interaction with his environment. As he interacts with others in an environment he gradually learns how to behave in such a way as to obtain some measure of gratification from them. As he further interacts with people and situations, he uses his set of already constructed beliefs and guides his subsequent action accordingly. Of course, that set of beliefs is constantly being redefined according to the individual's experienced success or failure. Thus, the two elements, belief and behavior, are closely intertwined; knowledge follows experience, but experience is shaped by prior knowledge. This set of beliefs and behaviors that one uses to further interpret his action is termed one's "definition of the situation" or "perspective."

Extended to a number of individuals, collective action takes place as individuals, seeking social rewards such as esteem, status and recognition,

ascertain the directions of others acts and then fit their lines of action together. A collectivity, then, is an acting unit made up of individuals who are themselves acting units. Just as an individual guides his actions according to his interpretation of his surroundings, so collectivities as acting units, guide themselves according to the members' preceived, shared understandings of the environment. Collectivities such as groups, also, engage in the process of constructing their action within their environment.

Or, as Becker, et. al., explained, the members of a collectivity will create a perspective. They will:

> Develop ideas in this interaction that, because they are held in common, create a universe of discourse, a common frame of reference in which communication may take place. Similarly, they develop, as they interact in a variety of institutional settings and specific situations, patterns of individual and collective activity. The activities grow out of the ideas being their logical extensions in actions. They also give weight and meaning to the ideas by creating patterns of everyday experience that make the ideas seem reasonable and appropriate to the situations they are applied to. In this sense, the ideas grow out of the activities.[62]

Analytically, the group perspective may be broken into: (a) a description of the environment within which the group exists, (b) the rewards that the members of the group may strive for in the environment, (c) the proper modes of individual behavior in the group and in the environment, and (d) criteria against which group members and others may be judged.

The term symbolic interaction and perspective are useful because they underlie our assumption that the teachers in the two schools are constantly in the processing of constructing systematic and reasonable ways to believe and behave in the schools. However we cannot oversimplify. There are some problems with the symbolic interaction approach to research. The first of these is that it forces one into taking a collective approach to a large number of people who may not constitute a collective at all, but who may merely find themselves in the same place at the same time. Second

it forces one not only to collectivize the aggragate of individuals, but to generalize about the collective, in effect generalizing at two levels. In other words, the theoretical approach to the study is such that it allows the results to be expressed only in certain terms.

While a serious problem, it seems that it is simply unavoidable. Any time one approaches a piece of social reality with the intent of explaining all or some of it, then there are certain a-priori's that he carries in with him. As Weber says, "A chaos of exintential judgements about countless individual events would be the only result of a serious attempt to analyze reality without presuppostions". And besides in our case there are some additional theoretical assists. The first is the general sociological assumption that individuals who find themselves in the same institutional setting do in fact develop certain common broad patterns regardless of their individual differences. While the sixty eight teachers in one building and the 101 in another certainly represented a broad range of differences, one could still assume that sharing that same environment and role as they did, they would develop some common patterns of behavior. It is then the researchers task to explicate those generalized patterns.

After all, in many ways the teachers in both schools behaved and probably believed in much the same way. The great majority of them came to school, accepted their assignments, complied with the rules and regulations and worked out their perspective toward teaching. The structure of the environment in which they worked did not differente them very much. The number of assigned students and classes, the salary schedule, the authority and reward structure and hiring practices treated all alike and hence we may assume that as reasonable individuals they developed some similar patterns of behavior. Our task was to explicate that generalized pattern

of behavior in terms of the networks that were developed.

Some Methodological Considerations

According to Blumer, the procedure suitable for studying a dynamic, social situtaion is to "approach the study of group activity through the eyes and experience of people who have developed the activity. Hence, it necessarily requires an intimate familiarity with this experience and with the scenes of its operation." He goes on to say: "The study of action would have to be made from the position of the actor. Such action is forged by the actor out of what he perceives, interprets and judges; one would have to see the operating situation as the actor sees it. You have to define and interpret the objects as the actor interprets them."[63] Having accepted the perspective and even the social reality, not as a static entity but as a creative process, it is the task of the researcher to actually take part in the process of creation. He simply cannot stand outside and make judgments about it. Again, according to Blumer:

> The objective approach holds the danger of the observer substituting his view of the field of action for the view held by the actor. It is unnecessary to add that the actor acts toward his world on the basis of how he sees it and not on the basis of how that world appears to the outside observer.[64]

The research methodology which enables the researcher to get closest to the social situation from the actor's point of view is participant observation.

> A participant observer in the field is at once reporter, interviewer, and scientist. On the scene he gets the story of an event by questioning participants about what is happening and why. He fills out the story by asking people about their relation to the event, their reactions, opinions, and evaluation of its significance. As an interviewer, he encourages an informant to tell his story, or supply an expert account of an organization or group. As scientist he seeks answers to questions, setting up hypotheses and collecting data with which to test them.[65]

The methodology works at two levels -- (1) Description: the researcher

on the scene describes what he reads, sees, and hears and then expands his descriptions from accounts of the situation by his subjects, and (2) Explanation: the researcher attempts to make sense of his subjects' observations and by further questioning of informants, obtains the explanation of the situation from the actors. Participant observation, then, (1) describes a social situation through the senses of the researcher and his subjects, and (2) explains the situation from the point of view of both the researcher and his subjects. Since the researcher is in part a principal, in him these two levels are combined.

As a researcher immerses himself in the situation, he simultaneously formulates tentative or working hypotheses, and as he continues his field work so he attempts to gather data which will either substantiate or contradict those hypotheses.

It may be unnecessary to mention the fact that participant observation is not meant to determine the final answer to any social phenomenon, rather it is purely exploratory and is to be used in cases where little work has been done. The final product of the study is the tentative explanation of social behavior which may be used to generate hypotheses for further testing. Like all research, the end of the participant observer's work is the beginning of someone else's.

There are two standard objections to participant observation. One is: since they deal with a limited and perhaps unique sample, the conclusions may be ungeneralizable. The reply is that while an instance of social phenomena may be unique, that need not prevent one from learning about and from it by intelligent study. While a situation may be unique, different people may react to it in much the same way. The uniqueness, therefore, lies in the social setting and not in the human reaction, and a good

description of a social phenomenon, however unique, may be quite intelligible to one who never participated.

A second, oft-repeated objection has to do with the absence of standardized tests of validity and reliability. This involves some explanation. Some researchers assume that social reality is objective and can be perceived by someone living close to and observing it. Others adhere to symbolic interaction and assume that participants actually create their own social reality, and, in order to understand it, should actually take part in that creation. I believe more strongly in the latter, but either way the strength of the methodology comes out. As one lives close to a situation, his description and explanation of it have a first person quality which other methodologies lack. As he continues to live close to and moves deeper into that situation his perceptions have a validity that is simply unapproachable by any so-called standardized method. Likewise, as his validity becomes better, so his reliability, which is an extension of his validity, becomes better. As the researcher is the actual instrument, as he becomes more aware, more valid, so he must of necessity become more reliable. A distinct advantage of the method is that it allows one to stay conceptually open until well after he had entered the setting and learned some things. For instance before we entered the schools, we tentitively suggested that there are networks of teachers in those two schools, and that educational issues get processed through these networks. But after we had entered the school and studied the situations for some time, we had to discard that notion in favor of our notion of egocentric fields and our analysis took that direction. The method is well suited for studies of places about which one has difficulty conceptualizing from without.

To produce a worthwhile study we endeavored to tailor our work to the six indices of subjective adequacy stated by Homans. (1) Time: the more time an individual spends with a group the more likely it is that he will obtain an accurate perception of the social meaning its members live by; (2) Place: the closer the researcher works geographically to the people he studies, the more accurate should be his interpretations; (3) Social circumstances: the number and variety of social circumstances which the observer encounters within the social structure of the community increase his accuracy; (4) Language: the researcher and his subjects should share a common language; (5) Intimacy: the greater degree of intimacy the researcher achieves, the greater his accuracy; (6) Consensus: confirmation that the meanings interpreted by the observer are correct. With these six indices in mind, the researcher who undertakes a participant observation study would have some assurance that his findings reach an acceptable degree of validity.

> The real proof of this study is in the presentation of the data.
>
> This rule, as obvious and important as it is, is seldom observed in sociology. Precisely because it treats everyday things, such as the family, property, crime, etc., the sociologist most often thinks it unnecessary to define them rigorously at the outset. We are so accustomed to use these terms, and they recur so constantly in our conversation, that it seems unnecessary to render their meaning precise. We simply refer to the common notion, but this common notion is very often ambiguous. As a result of this ambiguity, things that are very different in reality are given the same name and the same explanation and this leads to boundless confusion.

Because the things we deal with are common, one reporting such a study must present his findings in extensive narrative form. It is our job to render the descriptions in as complete and realistic a manner as possible. In fact, this is a major test of validity. If, as others who are engaged in similar situations upon reading the data agree that "that is the way it is," so our findings will demonstrate a higher degree of validity.

Entering the School

Participant observation is a somewhat inexact process and it is important to explain how we entered the setting, made initial contacts, developed and carried out a routine and compiled the notes. In the summer of 1978 the NIE put out a request for proposals dealing with networks in educational organizations. Because of my interest in organizational theory and in secondary schools, I suggested a study of networks in secondary schools. Before the proposal was ever written I solicited the cooperation of two friends, both of whom were assistant principals in secondary schools in northern Detroit, had interests in educational research and were highly regarded in their districts. Each agreed to serve as a co-researcher in the project and sponsor the project into the school. My reasons for soliciting their cooperation were obvious. There are few public school teachers who have not encountered researchers from universities, and there are some strong feelings among many teachers that these researchers, dispite their initial promises, do not help the schools, but use the schools for their own purposes and then leave. The teachers' feelings are probably justified. Researchers have their own perspective, their own agenda and referent group. Teachers may want help with this class, administrators with this problem or school, but the researcher with his or her theoretical perspective and rules of method is following a different line of thinking. These differences in perspective are difficult to bridge and therefore, when one intends to enter a school, it behoves him to solicit the cooperation of some highly regarded insiders. My second reason for doing this had to do with the nature of the setting. Secondary schools are very complex places with innumerable events taking place at the same time. With the cooperation of my co-researchers I was not only able to enter the schools with ease, but once there could have

their assistance with introductions, tips about issues, help in thinking about events, and take their suggestions for further leads. All in all it was a very successful move and one that I would recommend to anyone wishing to do a study in schools. There are in fact many people in schools who are interested in research, who enjoy the theoretical dimensions of thinking about schools and who already have or who will take on the researchers perspective and assist with a study. Of course we were careful never to confuse their roles. They never did the actual research because such a move might have endangered their primary jobs. With the active cooperation of my friends, I found that gaining the superintendents permission, the director of secondary education's permission and the principals and teachers permission was quite simple. My friends talked to those people, meetings were arranged, introductions made and permissions granted. It was the simplest entrance I could have imagined.

The field work in Utica started in January, 1979. I quickly established some routine based on the schedule. With a list of all staff members denoting not only classes but also free times, I would schedule initial interviews to talk about their lives in the school in general terms and while the interview was taking place would ask permission, if I thought it was appripriate, to stop in their class, stop back some time, or attend a later meeting of their department or group. These introductory interviews gave me some idea of who I could associate with more closely, of what issues were extant, of what other events I could attend and what more directed questions I might pursue. All this time I was following the process of using working hypotheses and then sharpening them or discarding them as evidence continued. In my own free time, I would write notes which would be typewritten at night.

But there were some additional elements. There were some problems withthe method. The fact is that in one school there were 68 teachers, in the second 101. On many points, the data that was gathered was incomplete because important actions went unrecorded even though they took place in the school or because they took place outside the school where I had no access. While this is a problem in most field studies, one makes his choice of method and has to accept the limit. And indeed he can overcome some of that limitation by looking more deeply into some particular aspect of the situation and then generalizing to the rest of the school. In particular, I was looking for some like minded teachers with whom I could eat, in who's office I could spend a free hour, with whom I might attend a saloon on Friday evening or a weekend ball game. That represents a form of nesting and in my opinion it is essential to a successful study. There are always discrete groups and cliques and sets in and setting, and when one enters a setting, he has to decide whether to join one or two of these or continually float through the system contacting first one person then another then another, and so on. My choice is always the nest because it gives one as access to the deeper and more meaningful life of the institution and hence a deeper understanding of the situation.

The disadvantage of the "nesting" is that as one spends more time with a few he spends less time with many. And too, each of these groups and cliques has its own norms, values and behaviors, which he must respect and abide by, further separating him from those who he would like to contact but now can't. But in my opinion the advantages of nesting with a few close insiders always outweighs the disadvantages. I found some people to eat and associate with regularly and after I assured them that there were some of their behaviors which were plainly not part of the

study, I was free to associate with them on a regular basis every day. And in fact even though this intense contact with a few while it limits ones general access, one is always dependent on inference and the inferences one makes from those few to the many is more plausible for his sharing that life.

Under the heading of participant observation are a number of variations, best stated by Lutz and Iannaccone who explained that "a researcher who undertakes a participant observation study may assume one of three roles":

1. "The participant as an observer": In this case the researcher already has his group membership before he undertakes a study and therefore his role as observer or researcher would be unknown to his subjects.

2. "The observer as a limited participant": The observer would join join a group for the expressed purpose of studying it. The members would, perhaps more than likely, know of the researcher's intent in joining the group.

3. "The observer as a non-participant": That is, without group membership. Here the presence of the observer may not even be known to the group and if it were known, he would still be outside the group.[68]

In this study my role was a conbination of one and two. While my outsider status was never confused simply because I was not a teacher, I could join in whatever general activities were going on, could talk to people at will, could carry on informal relations to some extant.

In this way, by interviewing and reinterviewing, by attending as many events and classes as possible, by being an informal associate of some few people in either school, I carried on the study in Utica until June 14, 1980. I followed much the same routine in Pontiac starting in September 1979 and finished there in March, 1980.

Footnotes

[1]J.A. Barnes, "Class and Committee in a Norwegian Island Parish," Social Networks, A Developing Paradigm, ed. Samuel Leinhart (New York: Academic Press, 1977), p. 237.

[2]Norman Shulman, "Network Analysis: A New Addition to an Old Bag of Tricks," Acta Sociologica (Vol. 19, No.3, 1976) :307.

[3]Edward J. Jay, "The Concept of 'Field' and 'Network' in Anthropological Research," MAN 177(September-October 1964) :137-139.

[4]Samuel Leinhart, Social Networks, A Developing Paradigm (New York: Academic Press, 1977), p. XXXI.

[5]A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, "On Social Structure," Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland (May 1940) :1-12.

[6]Leinhart, p. XIV.

[7]H. White, S. Boorman, and R. Breiger, "Social Structure from Multiple Networks," AJS 81 (January 1976) :732.

[8]John R.P. French, Jr., "A Formal Theory of Social Power," Psychological Review 63 (May 1956) :181.

[9]J.A.Barnes, Social Networks, An Addison-Wesley Module in Anthropology, No. 26, 1972, p. 2.

[10]Barnes, Social Networks, p. 13.

[11]Barnes, Social Networks, p. 13.

[12]J.A.Barnes, "Class and Committee in A Norwegian Island Parish," Human Relations 7 (February 1954) :50.

[13]Radcliffe-Brown, p. 6.

[14]Elizabeth Bott, "Urban Families, Conjugal Roles and Social Networks," Social Networks, A Developing Paradigm, ed. Samuel Leinhart (New York: Academic Press, 1977), p. 290.

[15]Charles Loomis, "Grouping in a Spanish-American Village," Sociology 4 (1941) :36-55.

[16]A.L. Epstein, "The Network and Urban Social Organization" Social Networks in Urban Situations, ed. J. Clyde Mitchell (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969), p. 80.

[17]D.M. Boswell, "Personal Crises and the Mobilization of the Social Network" Social Networks in Urban Situations, ed. J. Clyde Mitchell (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969), pp. 245-296.

[18]White, et al., pp. 733-734.

[19]Scott Boorman and H.C. White, "Social Structure from Multiple Networks" AJS 81 (May 1976) :1384-1442.

[20]Karl Hemphill, Aspects of Scientific Explanation (New York: Free Press, 1965), p. 299.

[21]Hemphill, p. 305.

[22]Hemphill, p. 329.

[23]Douglas S. Pugh, "Modern Organizational Theory, A Psychological and Sociological Study" Organizations and Human Behavior, ed. F. Carver and T. Sergiovanni (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), p. 125.

[24]Max Weber, The Methodology of the Social Sciences (New York: Free Press, 1949), p. 80.

[25]Martin Burlingame, "Coordination, Control and Facilitation of Instruction within the Schools," paper prepared for the School Organization and Effects Conference, San Diego, 1978, p. 5.

[26]Trent Shroyer, The University of the Hermeneutical Problem (New York: The New School for Social Research, 1970), p. 3.

[27]Shroyer, p. 3.

[28]Shroyer, p. 3.

[29]Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in a Capitalist Society (New York: Basic Books, 1976), p. 265.

[30]Jacque Ellol, The Technological Society (New York: Alfred Knopf 1964), pp. 14, 227.

[31]James Coleman, et al., Youth: Transition to Adulthood (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 81.

[32]John C. Holt, Escape From Childhood (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1974).

Herbert R. Kohl, 36 Children (New York: New American Library, 1968).

Jonathan Kozol, Death at an Early Age. (Boston: Hougton-Mifflin, 1967).

[33]James Thompson, Organizations in Action (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 18.

[34]Karl E. Weick, "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems," Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (March 1976) :3.

[35]M.Q. Patton and V. Perrone, "Does Accountability Count without Teacher Support? An Assessment of the Kalamazoo Public School Accountability System from the Perspective of Teachers," Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1976, p. 9.

[36]Harry Wolcott, Teacher vs. Technocrat (Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1977).

[37]Charles A. Clinton, "The Politics of Developmental Change," (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, Contract No. OEC - 0 - 72 - 5245, 1977), p. 110.

[38]Clinton, p. 153.

[39]Frederick Ignatovich, Philip Cusick and James Ray, "Value Belief Patterns of Teachers and Those Administrators Engaged in Attempts to Influence Teaching," (East Lansing: Research Series No. 43, Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1980).

[40]Dan Lortie, Schoolteacher (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), p. 169.

[41]Philip Cusick and Wayne Peters, "The Role of Secondary Principals in Small Towns," paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

[42]Lee Sproul, "Managerial Attention Patterns, A Micro-Behavioral Analysis," paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

[43]Philip Cusick, Inside High School (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973).

[44]Philip Cusick, William Martin and Stuart Palonsky, "Organizational Structure and Student Behavior in Secondary Schools," Journal of Curriculum Studies 8 (Spring 1976) :8.

[45]Herbert Simon, Administrative Behavior (New York: Free Press, 1957).

[46]Simon, p. 79.

[47]James Conant, The American High School Today (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), p. 9.

[48]Raymond Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 244.

[49]Callahan, p. 77.

[50]Callahan, p. 96.

[51]Callahan, p. 15.

[52]The Reform of Secondary Education, Report of the National commission on the Reform of Secondary Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973) p. 7.

[53]Gerald Grant, "What Makes Good School? The New Polity in Education," paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1980.

[54]Coleman, p. 145.

[55] Coleman, p. 157

[56]Giving Youth a Better Chance, A Report with Recommendato-ns of the Carnegie Council of Policy Studies in Higher Education (San Francisco: Josey Bass, 1979), p. 24.

[57]Giving Youth a Better Chance, pp. 23-24.

[58]Thompson, p. 13.

[59]Thompson, p. 61.

[60]Gil Scott Herron, "When the Revolution Comes" The Last Poets, 1970.

[61]Herbert Blumer, "Society as Symbolic Interaction, " Human Behavior and Social Processes, ed. by Arnold Rose (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1962). p. 180.

[62]Howard S. Becker, Blanche Geer, and Everett Hughes, Making The Grade, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968), p. 28.

[63]Herbert Blumer, "Sociological Implications of the Thought of G. H. Mead, " American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 71 (March 1966), p. 542.

[64]Blumer, "Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Herbert Mead," p. 542.

[65]Blanche Geer, "First Days in the Field," in Phillip E. Hammond, ed., Sociologist at Work (New York, Doubleday, 1964), p. 383.

[66]See Severyn T. Bruyn, The Human Perspective in Sociology: The Methodology of Participant Observation (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966), p. 181.

[67]Durkheim, Emile, The Rules of Sociological Method (The Free Press), 1968, p. 37.

[68]See Frank W. Lutz and Lawrence Iannaccone, Understanding Educational Organizations: A Field Study Approach (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1969), p. 108.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, B.W. "Interaction Theory and Soc. Network". Sociometry, 30 pp. 64-78.

Aronson, D.R. "Social Networks: Forward Structure or Process?" Canadian Review of Soc. and Anthro. (4), 1970 pp. 258-266.

Barnes, J.A. "Class and Committee in a Norwegian Island Parish," in Social Networks, A Developing Parodigm, ed. Sammuel Leinhart (New York: Academic Press, 1977).

Barnes, J.A. "Class and Committee in a Norwegian Island Parish," Human Relations 7 (February, 1954) 50 pp. 39-58/

Barnes, J. A. Social Networks, An Addison-Wesley Module in Anthropology, No. 26, 1972.

Blumer, Herbert 1962, "Society as Symbolic Interaction," in Arnold M. Rose, ed., Human Behavior and Social Processes, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company p. 14.

Blumer, Herbert 1966, "Sociological Analysis and the Variable". American Sociological Review, Vol. 21 (December), pp. 683-690.

Blumer, Herbert 1966, "Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Herbert Mead." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 71 (March) pp. 535-544.

Bolsseuain, Jeremy Friends of Friends. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1974.

Boorman, Scott and H.C. White "Social Structure from Multiple Networks" AJS 81 (May 1976) : 1384-1442.

Boswell, D.M. "Personal Crises and the Mobilization of the Social Network". Social Networks in Urban Situations, ed. J. Clyde Mitchell (Mancester: Manchester University Press, 1969), pp. 245-296.

Bott, Elizabeth Family and Social Network. (New York: The Free Press, 1971).

Bott, Elizabeth "Urban Families, Conjugal Roles and Social Networks," Social Networks, A Developing Paradigm, ed. Samuel Leinhart (New York: Academic Press, 1977).

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis Schooling in a Capitalist Society (New York: Basic Books, 1976).

Bruyn, Severry T. The Human Perspective in Sociology: The Methodology of Participant Observation. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Burlingame, Martin "Coordination, Control and Facilitation of Instruction within the Schools," paper prepared for the School Organization and Effects Conference, San Diego, 1978, p. 5.

Callahan, Raymond Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

Chrisman, Noel J. "Situation and Social Network in Cities," Canada Review of Soc and Anthro 4, 7, 1970, pp. 245-257.

Clinton, Charles A. "The Politics of Developmental Change" (Washington D.C.: National Institute of Education, Contract No. OEC-0-72-5245, 1977).

Coleman, James et al., Youth: Transition to Adulthood (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).

Conant, James The American High School Today (New York: McGraw Hill, 1959).

Cusick, Philip Inside High School (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973).

Cusick, Philip, William Martin and Stuart Palonsky "Organizational Structure and Student Behavior in Secondary Schools," Journal of Curriculum Studies, 8 (Spring 1976) :8, pp. 3-13.

Cusick, Philip and Wayne Peters,"The Role of Secondary Principals in Small Towns," paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

Ellol, Jacque The Technological Society (New Tork: Alfred Knopf, 1964) pp. 14, 227.

Epstein, A.L., "The Network and Urban Social Organization" Social Networks in Urban Situations, ed. J. Clyde Mitchell (Mancester: Mancester University Press, 1969), p. 80.

Festinger, L., S. Schachter and K. Back Social Pressures in Informal Groups, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1950).

Firth, Raymond "Social Organization and Social Change" Presidential Address, The Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, No. 84.

French, Jr., John R. P. "A Formal Theory of Social Power," Psychological Review 63 (May 1956) pp. 181-194.

Friedmin, Norman "University Social Structure and Social Networks" AJS, May 1978, pp. 1444-1465.

Geer, Blanche 1964, "First Days in the Field," in Phillip E. Hammond, ed., Sociologist at Work (New York: Doubleday & Company).

Giving Youth a Better Chance, A Report with Recommendations of the Carnegie Council of Policy Studies in Higher Education (San Francisco: Josey Bass, 1979).

Glaser, Bernard and Anselm Strauss, "Theoretical Sampling" In Norman K. Denzin, ed., Sociological Methods (Aldine Publishing Company, 1970), pp. 105-114.

Granovetter, Mark "Network Sampling: Some First Steps", American Journal of Soc, 81, 6, May 1976, pp. 1287-1303.

Grant, Gerald "What Makes Good School? The New Polity in Education," paper presented at the American Ecuational Research Association, Boston, 1980.

Habermas, Jürgen Knowledge And Human Interest, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968).

Hemphill, Karl Aspects of Scientific Explanation (New York: Free Press, 1965).

Herron, Gil Scott "When the Revolution Comes", The Last Poets, 1970.

Ignatovich, Frederick, Philip Cusick and James Ray, "Value Belief Patterns of Teachers and Those Administrators Engaged in Attempts to Influence Teaching," (East Lansing: Research Series No. 43, Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University, 1980).

Jay, Edward J. "The Concept of 'Field' and 'Network' in Anthropological Research," MAN 177 (September-October 1964) :137-139.

Kohn, Melvin L., "Occupational Structure and Alienation", AJS, 82:1, pp. 111-130.

Leinhart, Samuel Social Networks, A Developing Paradigm (New York: Academic Press, 1977), p. XXXI.

Lortie, Dan Schoolteacher (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), p. 169.

Lutz, Frank W., and Laurence Iannoaccone Understanding Educational Organizations: A Field Study Approach.

Marks, Stephen R. "Multiple Roles and Role Strain: Some Notes on Human Energy, Time and Commitment", American Sociological Review, Vol. 42, December, 1977, pp. 921-936.

Moore, Gwen "The Structure of a National Elite Network", American Sociological Review, 44, October 1979, pp. 673-692.

Mullens, Nicholas C. "The Distribution of Social and Cultural Properties in Informal Communication Networks Among Biological Scientists" ASR, 33, October 1968, pp. 786-797.

Patton, M.Q. and V. Perrone "Does Accountability Count Without Teacher Support? An Assessment of the Kalamazoo Public School Accountability System from the Perspective of Teachers", Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1976, p. 9.

Pugh, Douglas S. "Modern Organizational Theory, A Psychological and Sociological Study", Organizations and Human Behavior, ed. F. Carver and T. Sergiovanni (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), p. 125.

Radcliffe-Brown, A.R. "On Social Structure," Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland 70 (May 1940) :1-12.

The Reform of Secondary Education, Report of the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

Scott, John P. "Critical Social Theory: An Introduction and Critique", British Journal of Sociology: 29, No. 1, March 1978, pp. 1-17.

Shibutani, Tamotsu 1967, "Reference Groups as Perspectives", Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer, eds., Symbolic Interaction, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, pp. 159-170.

Shroyer, Trent The Universality of the Hermeneutical Problem (New York: The New School for Social Research, 1970), p. 3.

Shulman, Norman "Network Analysis: A New Addition to an Old Bag of Tricks", Acta Sociologica, (Vol. 19, No. 4, 1976) :307-320.

Sieber, Sam D., "Toward a Theory of Role Accumulation", American Sociological Review, 39, August 1974, pp. 567-78.

Simon, Herbert Administrative Behavior (New York: Free Press, 1957).

Snoek, J. Diedrick "Role Strain in Diversified Role Sets", Vol. LXXI, No. 4, January 1966, pp. 363-372.

Sproul, Lee "Managerial Attention Patterns, A Micro-Behavioral Analysis," paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

Thompson, James Organizations in Action (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 18.

Weber, Max The Methodology of the Social Sciences (New York: Free Press, 1949).

Weick, Karl E. "Educational Organizations As Loosely Coupled Systems", Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (March 1976) :3.

White, H., S. Boorman, and R. Breiger "Social Structure from Multiple Networks", AJS 81 (January 1976) : 730-780.

Wolcott, Harry Teacher vs. Technocrat (Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1977).